

The Classical Review

JULY 1896.

TYRTAEUS: A GRAECO-ROMAN TRADITION.

THE history of poetry, says Horace,¹ begins with the various lore attributed to such half-mythical personages as Orpheus and Amphion, and presents to us next the famous names of Homer and of Tyrtaeus, 'whose verses made sharp for battle the souls of men'. It is implied by the context that this conjunction, though partly suggested by community of spirit between the poet of the *Iliad* and the military bard of Lacedaemon, is also justified by chronology; and in fact, if we accept the tradition which ruled in the Roman schools and still rules in modern manuals, the elegiacs and anapaests, composed by Tyrtaeus for the encouragement of the Spartans in their struggle to recover Messenia, were the earliest pieces of literature, strictly historical and datable, which the Greeks possessed. According to the story presented to us in its entirety by Pausanias, and accepted in substance by all writers of the Roman age, the original subjugation of Messenia was accomplished in two episodes, a first conquest and a rebellion, separated by an interval of about one generation. The central date is B.C. 700. The activity of Tyrtaeus was assigned, since he expressly describes his war as a war of recovery, not to the first of these contests but to the second, and his date therefore stood about B.C. 680. The modern speculations, which would bring it a little lower, assuming for the moment that they work on a substantial foundation, would still make no essential difference. If we place Tyrtaeus at any time before 650, we put him as high as we

can with assurance put any extant Greek literature, except the primitive Epos or portions of it: and if in that age or near it his elegiacs, being what they are, were current and popular in Laconia, their importance to history in many respects is such as we cannot easily overrate. The object of this paper is to overturn this hypothesis completely, not by any speculative argument, but by direct testimony, the full, plain, and conclusive statement of the principal and only trustworthy witness who speaks to the point.

The adventures of Tyrtaeus in the 'second Messenian war' of the seventh century, as admitted or partly admitted by modern historians, are the remnant of an elaborate 'house on the sands,' some time since flooded and ruined by the rain of criticism. All, I believe, are now agreed, and it is therefore needless to argue, that about these primeval conflicts between the Spartans and Messenians the ancients had no solid information, except what they might rightly or wrongly infer from the poems of Tyrtaeus. To support that long romance, all omens, oracles, desperate amours, miraculous feats, and hair-breadth escapes, which is reproduced in detail by Pausanias, no authority is even pretended, except writers, the chief of them a poet, separated by four centuries from the events supposed: and if Rhianus of Crete or Myron of Priene troubled themselves about the evidence for their novels any more than Scott troubled himself about the evidence for *Ivanhoe*, they must have found that evidence in such oral

¹ *Ars Poetica* 401.

tradition as may have been propagated in Messenian cabins during the dark ages of oppression, ready to emerge and expand after the deliverance effected in the fourth century by Epaminondas. But for that deliverance, as Grote remarks, we should probably have heard little or nothing about the original resistance. The historians or quasi-historians of the third and later centuries would probably then have left the events of the 'first and second Messenian wars' in that general oblivion which seems to cover them down to the age of Aristotle. In these circumstances scientific criticism had a simple task. Aristomenes, the protagonist of the alleged Messenian insurrection, belongs to that class of popular heroes whose history is naught and their very existence not unquestionable. He may stand possibly above Tell or Vortigern, but not with William Wallace or Llewelyn, perhaps on a level with Hereward the Wake. For serious writers it is now enough to mention his name.¹

If therefore these same writers treat on a totally different footing the connexion of this same episode with the life of Tyrtaeus, if for the 'second Messenian war' they use the fragments of Tyrtaeus as confidently as Aeschylus for the battle of Salamis, they do so not because this proceeding is countenanced by Pausanias, nor out of deference to any witness who can have been influenced by the transfiguration performed upon the history of Messenia in the romances of the third century. Pausanias, and in general all the writers of later antiquity, accepted and circulated so much about primitive Messenia which no one would accept now, that we should concern ourselves little, if that were the question, with what they allege about Tyrtaeus. But in fact the poems of Tyrtaeus, and his story, complete in all essential features, can be traced, not indeed into the seventh century, but well above the level of Rhianus or Myron.² Already in the fourth century both he and his works were known and had admirers at Athens. He is cited and some points in his life are noticed by Plato in the *Laws*; he is extolled by the orator Lycurgus, who also narrates at length the circumstances in

which his elegies were composed. And more significant than all upon the question of his historical validity, Aristotle, in the *Politics*, adduces without scruple the witness of his poem entitled *Eunomia*, or *The Blessings of Order*, as to the effect of external pressure in producing a particular kind of political discontent. It is upon the strength of these names, which certainly make together as strong a body of evidence as could be desired, that historians now accept what can be learnt from or about Tyrtaeus as affording a glimpse at least of 'the second Messenian war'. Rhianus cannot have seduced Plato; Lycurgus had not read Myron; Aristotle had probably never heard, and certainly did not depend upon, any fire-side anecdotes that may have run loose in Messenia. If all three are agreed—and they are—in accepting a certain belief about Tyrtaeus, it was probably in the main well-founded. But the question remains, What was it?

Of the three, the fullest and most explicit statement is that of the orator. The allusions of Plato and Aristotle, though they support that statement so far as they go, and are significant when read in the light of it, contain but little information, and upon the vital point are in themselves uncertain. The account of Lycurgus, which words could hardly make plainer or more definite than it is, puts everything, if we believe him, beyond question. In reading it we should bear in mind that the speaker was in his day perhaps the very first figure in the literary world of Athens, not so much for his actual production, which is and was always reckoned imperfect, as for his political and social character, his zealous and somewhat ostentatious interest in educational matters at large. If there is any person from whom we may accept the assurance that at Athens in the latter part of the fourth century a certain piece of Athenian history was unquestioned, that person is Lycurgus, who shall now be quoted at length. He is dilating upon the beauty and praises of patriotism, which he has illustrated from Euripides; and he continues the subject as follows.³

Another authority, whom I would commend to your approbation, is Homer: a poet of whose merit your forefathers had so high an opinion, that they appointed his works by law to be recited, solely and exclusively, at the quadrennial celebration of the Panathenaea, as an advertisement to Hellas that the noblest of actions were the chosen ideal of Athens. And in this they did well. Laws in their brevity

¹ See for example Beloch. *Gr. Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 284. Those who (as Prof. Holm and Mr. Abbott) condescend to repeat the narrative of Pausanias do so under reservations effectually destructive; and in fact there is no controversy about the matter.

² The date of Myron cannot be fixed, but that he was an author of the same kind and standing as Rhianus is plain from the account and treatment of him in Pausanias.

³ Lycurgus, pp. 162-163, c. *Leocr.* §§ 102-109.

command what is right, but do not teach it: it is the poets, with their pictures of human life, who select the noblest examples, and also by reason and demonstration recommend them to men. Take for instance the patriotic exhortation which is addressed to the Trojans by Hector,

'Fight to the ships, fight on: and whoso meets
Perchance from sword or spear the fated death,
E'en let him die! To die defending Troy
Mis-seems him not; and for his wife and babes,
They are saved, and safe his homestead and his
fields,
If but the foeman's navy homeward fly.'

This, gentlemen, is the poetry to which your ancestors used to listen; and the ambition of deeds like these wrought in them such a valour, that not for their own city only, but for Hellas also, our common fatherland, they were ready to lay down their lives, as was seen when the army of Marathon gave battle to the foreigner and defeated the host of Asia, imperilling themselves to win security for the whole Greek brotherhood, and proud not of their glory but of the deeds by which it was deserved. They had made Athens the champion of Hellas and mistress over the national foe, because their manly virtue was not exercised in phrases, but exhibited to the world in act. And therefore so excellent, both as a body and as individuals, were the men by whom our city was in those days administered, that when the Lacedaemonians, who in earlier times were first in martial qualities, had a war with the Messenians, they were commanded by the oracle to take a leader from among us, and were promised victory, if they did so, over their opponents. And if to the descendants of Heracles (for such have been ever the kings of Sparta) the Delphian god preferred a leader from among us, it must be supposed that the merit of our countrymen was beyond all comparison. It is matter of common knowledge that the director, whom they received from Athens, was Tyrtaeus, with whose help they overcame their enemies, and also framed a system of discipline for their youth, a measure of prudence looking beyond the peril of the moment to the permanent advantage of the future. Tyrtaeus left to them elegies of his composition, by the hearing of which their boys are trained to manliness: and whereas of other poets they make no account, for this one they are so zealous as to have enacted that, whenever they are under arms for a campaign, all should be summoned to the king's tent, to hear the poems of Tyrtaeus; nothing, as they think, could so well prepare the men to meet a patriot's death. It is good that you should listen to some of these elegiacs, and thus learn what manner of poetry obtained the approval of Sparta.

'He nobly dies, who, foremost in the band,
Falls bravely fighting for his fatherland;
But, beggared and expelled, to utter woes
From town or happy farm the exile goes,
With all his dearest vagabond for life,
Old sire, sweet mother, babes, and wedded wife.
No loving welcome waits him in the haunt
Where need may drive him and the stress of want.
His birth to stain, his person to deface,
All vileness cleaves to him, and all disgrace.
If, then, the wanderer pines in such neglect,
And all his seed are doomed to disrespect;
Fierce for our country let us fight to death
And for our children fling away our breath.
Stand firm, young gallants, each to other true;
Let never rout or scare begin with you.
Stout be your hearts within, your courage high,
And fighting, reck not if ye live or die.

Your elders there, whose limbs are not so light,
Betray not ye their honour by your flight.
What shame it were, upon the field to find
The wounded, age in front and youth behind!
To see the hapless senior, hoar and gray,
Gasp in the dust his noble soul away,
His hands the bleeding entrails holding in—
O sight to taint the very eyes with sin!—
His body bare! . . . But nothing misbecomes
The lad, whose youth in him yet lovely teems:
Eyes, hearts adore him, while he draws his breath;
And, falls he vanward, fair he is in death.
So plant you each one firmly on the land
With open stride, set tooth to lip,—and stand'.

Yes, gentlemen, they are fine verses, and profitable to those who will give them attention. And the people therefore, which was in the habit of hearing this poetry, was so disposed to bravery, that they disputed the primacy with Athens, a dispute for which, it must be admitted, there was reason on both sides in high actions formerly achieved. Our ancestors had defeated that first invading army landed by the Persians upon Attica, and thus revealed the superiority of courage above wealth and of valour above numbers. The Lacedaemonians in the lines of Thermopylae, if not so fortunate, in courage surpassed all rivalry. And the bravery of both armies is therefore visibly and truly attested before Hellas by the sepulchral inscriptions, the barrow at Thermopylae bearing the lines

'Go tell to Sparta, thou that passest by,
That here obedient to her laws we lie',

while over your ancestors it is written,

'Foremost at Marathon for Hellas' right
The Athenians humbled Media's gilded might'.

Such is the passage which—the fact may appear astonishing, but it shall presently be accounted for—is constantly mentioned in histories and books of reference, as part of the evidence for the current assertion that Tyrtaeus lived and wrote two hundred years before the Persian war. Is it not surely manifest beyond all possibility of debate, if only we raise the question, that on that supposition the whole narrative and argument of Lycurgus would be nonsense? Lycurgus assumes, and calls it a 'matter of common knowledge', that Tyrtaeus flourished about a hundred years before his own time, *between the Persian war and the Peloponnesian*, and that the Messenian war, in which Tyrtaeus served the Lacedaemonians, was that of our fifth century, now dated about 464–454 B.C. The preference, he says, given by the Spartans with divine sanction to Tyrtaeus, an Athenian, over their own countrymen, was a *consequence* and *attestation* of the virtue displayed by Athens in the defeat and conquest of the Persians. And again, the teaching of Tyrtaeus, by restoring and elevating the Spartan character, encouraged and enabled the Spartans to dispute the pre-eminence which (according to the orator) in the times immediately follow-

ing the deliverance of Hellas had belonged without question to Athens. How can this be understood, or what can it mean, if Tyrtaeus had lived and done this work, had strengthened the Lacedaemonian arms and improved the Lacedaemonian schooling, two hundred and fifty years before Athens and Sparta contended for the hegemony, and a full century or more before that public adoption of Homer by Athens as the basis of an improved education, from which the orator (rightly, though not perhaps exactly on the right grounds) deduces, as an effect, the primacy of Athens, and the greatness displayed by his city at Marathon, at Salamis, and in the development of the Confederacy of Delos? Athens became so pre-eminent about B.C. 475, that she bestowed a teacher upon Sparta—in 680? Sparta from about B.C. 445 began to dispute that pre-eminence of Athens, by virtue of an education adopted—in 680?

The meaning of Lycurgus is so plain, and so plainly stated, that we hardly know how to suppose it to have been overlooked. But it is at any rate the fact that, in the best and most recent expositions, which I can discover, the early date of Tyrtaeus is taken as constant, without a hint that, according to one at least of the oldest witnesses adduced, that date is wrong by a trifle of two centuries. And there is a possible reason for this, which is itself not the least curious part of the case. It is not indeed possible, as I think, to read the whole passage of Lycurgus, with a mind awake to the question, 'At what date does he put Tyrtaeus?', without arriving at the right answer. But it is easy (I may perhaps say so, as I have done it several times myself) to inspect the place, or even to glance through the paragraph, under the presumption that Lycurgus adopts the common date, without perceiving that he does not. It happens that, exactly at the point upon which a student 'verifying the reference' would chiefly fix his attention, accident has prepared for a mind so preoccupied the possibility of mistake: *τοιγαροῦν*—so begin the sentences which mention Tyrtaeus—*οὕτως ἦσαν ἄνδρες σπουδαῖοι καὶ κοῦη καὶ ἰδίᾳ οἱ τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες, ὥστε τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις πολεμοῦσι πρὸς Μεσσηνίους ἀνέλεν ὁ θεὸς παρ' ἡμῶν ἡγέμονα λαβεῖν κ.τ.λ.* The words *ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις* are in themselves, as a relative term, open to ambiguity, and in this place may be affected by different punctuations; so that there are not only three ways of understanding them,

all consistent with the general sense of the passage, but even a fourth, which is not. Either we may read them with the verbs of the sentence, *πολεμοῦσιν* and *ἀνέλεν*, '... that when the martial Lacedaemonians had in former times a war with the Messenians, they were commanded . . . : ' in that case *former*, by the context, must be relative to the date of the speech, and the point (as in *οἱ τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες*) is to contrast the ancient consideration of Athens with her enfeeblement, so bitterly felt by the orator, in his own days. Or else—which seems preferable, and even perhaps necessary to make the description *τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις* significant in itself and harmonious with the rest—we may take together *τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις*,¹ '... that when the Lacedaemonians, who were in former times first in martial qualities had a war with the Messenians': in this case *former* may be relative to the times of which the orator has been speaking, and the meaning then is that, before the contest with Persia and rise of Athens, Sparta in military spirit had been unquestionably first: this, which is true, he notes in order to enhance the compliment paid to the new rival, when Sparta borrowed Tyrtaeus from Athens. Or again, while adopting this second construction, we may refer *former* to the date of the speech: in that case the contrast will be between the ancient might and present feebleness of Sparta. Between these three the choice is open and unimportant.

But again fourthly, by taking *ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις* with the verbs of the sentence, and also assuming that *former* is relative to the events narrated, it is easy, *currente oculo*, to read this particular clause as if the 'war with the Messenians' preceded the Persian wars of which Lycurgus has been speaking. Consideration will indeed show that this interpretation deprives of meaning even the sentence in which the words occur, to say nothing of the general argument. Nevertheless, if we bring to Lycurgus the presupposition about Tyrtaeus which would have been brought,

¹ As to the order of the words see Kühner *Gr. Grammar* § 461, 8. The example would fall under his class *d*, *τὸν βέλτονα ποταμὸν διὰ τῆς πόλεως* (Xen. *Hell.* 5, 2, 4), *ὁ δυσμενέστατος ἄνθρωπος τῇ πόλει* (Demosth. *Crown* 197), etc. Two other arrangements would have been possible (1) *τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις Λακεδαιμονίοις*, and (2) *τοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀνδρειοτάτοις*, but the first is cumbersome, and the second, though otherwise natural, was to be avoided from the cacophony of *τοῖς ἐν τοῖς*.

as we shall see, by Strabo, Diodorus, Pausanias, Athenaeus, Justin (supposing that any of them consulted him on the point), and which has been brought there by every modern, we may well go away with the same supposition unquestioned, and justified, as we imagine, by fresh authority. In this way, arguing perhaps presumptuously from my own repeated error, I am inclined to account for the citation of Lycurgus by Grote—and by others who must be supposed to have verified the reference—among the witnesses for the presence of Tyrtaeus at the 'second Messenian war' as related by writers both ancient and modern. But be the explanation what it may, the error is, I venture to say, patent and indisputable. Lycurgus dates Tyrtaeus not in the seventh century B.C., but in the fifth.

Now it would be strange indeed if important events, assigned by a man like Lycurgus, upon 'common knowledge', to the century preceding his own, were nevertheless placed at the distance of three centuries by such contemporaries and countrymen of his as Plato and Aristotle. But Aristotle agreed with him, and so, for anything that appears to the contrary, did Plato. Aristotle cites Tyrtaeus apparently once, on the point that in aristocracies disturbances may arise from any cause, war being the most common, which makes in the governing body a very rich class and a very poor class. 'This also', he says, 'occurred in Lacedaemon in connexion with the Messenian war, as appears from the poem of Tyrtaeus entitled *The Blessings of Order*. Some, who were reduced to distress by the war, demanded a redistribution of the land'.¹ Now would it be natural, or even intelligible, thus to refer an event to 'the Messenian war', if history, as conceived by Aristotle, had presented three 'Messenian wars', three conflicts between Sparta and Messenia, distant from his own time about 100, 300, and 350 years respectively? It would be as if an English political writer should now say 'an illustration of this may be found in the *Crusade*', leaving us to choose between the nine. But the truth appears to be that in the time of Aristotle there was no fixed and accreditd history of any 'Messenian war' except one, and that was of course the war

mentioned by Lycurgus, the war of the fifth century described in outline by Thucydides. About the earlier, primeval conflicts, though there were tales very recent for the most part in notoriety,² serious students did not yet pretend to know anything definite: the 'first war' and the 'second', with their dates and episodes, were among the many events of remote antiquity about which the historians of the decadence were so much better informed than their authorities. That the words of Aristotle in themselves compel us to this view, I would not say; but reading them in connexion with what Lycurgus gives as the 'common knowledge' of his time, which was also the time of Aristotle, we cannot reasonably refuse an interpretation which not only brings the two into accord but is also most natural in itself. It may be added that, as scientific evidence, the *Eunomia* of Tyrtaeus much better deserved the attention of Aristotle, if known to date from the daylight age of Cimon and Pericles, than if it had been supposed to descend from the twilight of 680 B.C.

As for Plato, his references to Tyrtaeus do not import, so far as I can discover, any opinion about his date, unless indeed we choose, for the credit of Plato himself, to see such an indication in his remarking, as if it were a fact well-known and ascertained, that Tyrtaeus 'was born an Athenian and became a Lacedaemonian'.³ If Tyrtaeus was born in the eighth century, it is more than unlikely that any sound evidence about such biographical particulars was attainable; nor is it, I think, the habit of Plato thus to expose himself to criticism without reason. It is otherwise, if Tyrtaeus belonged to the generation of Sophocles. In another place⁴ the phrase 'Homer, Tyrtaeus, and the other poets', read by itself, might seem to suggest a remote antiquity: but any reader of the *Laws* will be aware that Homer and Tyrtaeus are joined here for the same reason which brings them together in the passage already quoted from Lycurgus. Plato, like the orator, is comparing literature with legislation in respect of its moral and educational effect; and Tyrtaeus at Sparta, as Homer at Athens, was pre-eminently the poet of the schools. It is however not improbable that the conjunction thus originated, which re-appears, as we saw, in the *Ars Poetica*, helped to countenance, though it had really

¹ *Politics* 5 (8), 6, συνέβη δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν Μεσσηνιακῶν πόλεμον. ὁ δὲ [καὶ τοῦτο] ἐκ τῆς Τυρταίου ποιήσεως τῆς καλουμένης Εὐνομίας κ.τ.λ. In the second clause καὶ τοῦτο is not explained by the context as it stands, since Tyrtaeus has not been cited before. It has perhaps slipped in from the preceding clause, where it is explained by a reference to Lacedaemonian history shortly preceding.

² The extant allusions are with scarcely an exception later than Leuctra, and after this begin (with Isocrates) immediately.

³ *Laws* 629 A.

⁴ *Ib.* 858 E.

nothing to do with chronology, the chronological error which we shall presently trace.¹

Such is our oldest evidence, our only evidence which relatively to the matter can be called ancient, respecting the date of Tyrtaeus; and such was the opinion of Athens in the fourth century. It remains to consider, whether that opinion was right, or whether, counting heads, we should prefer the strangely different opinion which in Roman times prevailed, so far as appears, without dispute.

Now in the first place, as against anything short of a proved impossibility, the statement of Lycurgus, considering the nature of the subject and the circumstances of the speaker, ought surely to be taken as conclusive. The public speakers of Athens, even in formal orations carefully revised, were inaccurate in matters of history, and sometimes deceptive; but surely there were limits. It is not quite easy to suggest an adequate modern parallel to the folly of Lycurgus in composing and deliberately uttering his remarks about Tyrtaeus, if there was any possibility of doubt whether the Athenian poet, whom he places only two or three generations before himself, did really live then, and not (if we may borrow the phrase) in the Middle Ages. Imagine the Earl of Shaftesbury or the Earl of Halifax, at a debate in the presence of Charles the Second, reminding his audience of 'the important missions which, as Your Lordships will all be aware, were entrusted to the poet Chaucer by Queen Elizabeth', and printing it afterwards in a pamphlet! A highly accomplished Athenian of the fourth century, alleging in public assembly that another Athenian, 'as every one knows', lived and played a public part in the fifth, can scarcely be refuted, let us repeat, by anything less than the intrinsic impossibility. Where then is the intrinsic impossibility, or improbability, that the poems of Tyrtaeus, and the story told of him, referred to the Messenian war of 464 B.C.? The extant fragments consist almost entirely of commonplace, equally applicable to any war; and from the few references to person or place nothing can be gathered but that the war in question was being waged by Sparta for the recovery of Messenia. Moreover we happen

to know, and shall have occasion presently to remember, that in this respect the fragments fairly show the character of the whole poems, as possessed by the ancients. For Pausanias reports, and on this point is a competent witness, that Tyrtaeus did not mention the names even of the contemporary kings of Sparta.² About earlier history, or rather legend, we do learn a little from the fragments, among other things that the original conquest of Messenia occupied a round twenty years, and that it was achieved by 'our ancestors' ancestors'—or 'fathers' fathers', whichever word we prefer³—that is to say, 'in the old, old days'. But there is nothing whatever in the way of statement or allusion which marks the seventh century as the time of writing, or excludes the fifth. As little is there of antique note in the language, which is in the main the regular hackneyed *lingua franca* of Greek elegiac verse at all periods from Simonides downwards. Whether it could have been written in B.C. 680 may be questionable, but let that stand by; it could certainly have been written in B.C. 460.

As for the story related about Tyrtaeus, so far from requiring a date in the seventh century, it becomes intelligible and credible only when restored to its place in the fifth. Taken apart from rhetorical colour, the facts, as alleged by Lycurgus, are these. Tyrtaeus was an Athenian of some literary talent, who, having become associated with the Lacedaemonians at a time when they were distressed in war against Messenia, rose to high consideration among them through the popularity of his martial and patriotic poetry, which not only served for the moment to rouse and restore the national spirit, but also, after the victory, was adopted by Spartan authority, with his help and direction, as permanent material for an improved education. To this account, of which the latter part, relating to education, is supported by Plato, and the former part, the connexion with the Messenian war, by Aristotle, we should perhaps add, as derived, if we can trust indirect evidence, from respectable Athenian authority, later by one generation, that the Attic home of Tyrtaeus was Aphidnae.⁴ Referred to the

² 4, 15, 1.

³ Frag. 3 πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρας. The attempt to make out of this phrase something definite in the way of chronology is properly abandoned by Beloch, *Gr. Geschichte*, p. 285 (note).

⁴ Philochorus, with Callisthenes and others (according to Strabo). For the birthplace they are cited distinctly; what more, if anything, comes from them we cannot say, and indeed it would be unsafe to assume that Strabo cites at first hand.

¹ It is perhaps worth notice that the passage about Tyrtaeus given in the *scholia* to the *Laws* is itself, like the text, perfectly consistent with his true date. Probably this is accidental; but it is not impossible that the note, which bears no certain mark of modernity, is as old as the *Laws* or indeed—for it has no special bearing on Plato—even older.

seventh century all this is justly thought open, not only to various objections of detail, but to one comprehensive objection, that the narrators had no means of knowing it. Referred to the fifth century, it is perfectly probable and warrantable. That the Lacedaemonians then sought and received aid from Athens against the revolt of the Messenians is a fact. The Athenian troops were, in memorable circumstances, abruptly sent back; but that a certain individual Athenian emigrated, and achieved by means happily suited to the occasion what is described by Lycurgus and more soberly by Plato, is not only credible, but ought on such evidence to be without hesitation believed. In particular the educational function of Tyrtaeus, a mere absurdity if attributed to the Sparta of 670, when even in Attica there was not yet, and was not to be for another century, any 'plan of education' or so much as a school, becomes, with the date 450, significant and interesting. At that time Sparta, in regard to the cultivation of the popular intelligence, was much behind the age, and at an immense distance behind her new rival on the Piræus. Nothing is more likely than that the humiliations of the Messenian war, and specially the humiliation of having petitioned, even temporarily, for the aid of Athenian wits, awakened the Spartan government to this among their other deficiencies, and that they employed to mend it an Athenian who had shown his power of pleasing their countrymen. That the educator gave to his own works a dominant place in the curriculum is a pleasing touch of nature, and indeed in the circumstances it was probably the best thing that he could do. One thing only Lycurgus alleges to which we must demur, that Tyrtaeus was adopted by the Spartans directly in obedience to the Delphic oracle. And even this is nothing but what they themselves must have said and believed *ex post facto*. That they procured an oracle for their application to Athens is proved by the application itself: in the politics of Sparta the sanction of Apollo was common form. The result was disappointment, and also unexpected success. The Athenian general and his army gave offence and were dismissed; while an Athenian of no likelihood helped to rehabilitate Sparta by ways unforeseen. That 'Apollo' thereupon disclaimed the failure and claimed the triumph, by identifying the destined 'leader' with Tyrtaeus, and that piety subscribed, all this is matter of course.

And the true date also dissolves another mystery: why it is near the middle of the fourth century, and not before, that Tyrtaeus is brought to our notice. If his works had been extant in Lacedaemonia, and had exercised their influence there, ever since the alleged time of 'the second Messenian war', it is strange that three centuries of silence should cover documents of such peculiar interest. Specially remarkable is the neglect of Plato, who certainly wanted not interest in the antiquities either of poetry, or of education, or of Sparta. In the *Republic* and elsewhere are many places which, given the now prevailing notion about Tyrtaeus, must suggest his name to the mind. Yet we find it nowhere before the work of Plato's last years. But the fact is that, although the career of Tyrtaeus is worth curiosity, his poetry, divested of its fictitious date, is not remarkable. It is clear and spirited, correct in sentiment and diction, but wonderfully verbose and platitudinous. I speak of the elegiacs; of the anapaestic marches we have not enough to estimate, but they seem to have been essentially of the same quality. At Athens, amid the sunset of Aeschylus and the dawn of Sophocles, a reputation could no more have been made by such verses than now by correct and well-sounding heroic couplets. Hundreds could do it, if not as well, nearly as well; and indeed it is part of the tradition that in his native city Tyrtaeus was of no account. Lacedaemonia was a different field, and he hit, both as man and as writer, the Lacedaemonian taste. But this would not serve him elsewhere; it was not to Lacedaemonia that people went for literary fashions, and least of all the Athenians, who dictated them. For two generations we hear nothing of him, and probably little was said. But about that time circumstances changed somewhat in his favour; after Aegospotami the foreign communications of Sparta were of necessity somewhat enlarged; and Leuctra did much to remove the barrier between the country of his birth and the country of his adoption. At any rate he began to have readers even in Athens. To Plato, a theorist on education, the poems were interesting in their moral aspect as a school-book, but they 'bored' him nevertheless, as he reveals by one of those delightful touches of drama, which in the *Laws* are only too rare:

The Athenian. For example, let us bring before us Tyrtaeus, who was born an Athenian but adopted by the country of our friends from Lacedaemon. No one has insisted more strenuously on the importance

of martial qualities. 'I would not name, nor reckon in the list', he says, a man, though he might be ever so wealthy, though he were endowed with various advantages (of which the poet names perhaps all that there are), who did not on every occasion distinguish himself in war. May I presume that you (to *Cleinias the Cretan*) have heard these poems? Our friend has no doubt had enough of them.

The Lacedaemonian. Yes, indeed.

Cleinias. Oh, they have reached us in Crete; they were imported from Lacedaemon!¹

Few perhaps, except Plato, could have marked so neatly the special vice of tediousness in elegiacs, the tendency, produced by the form, to make every point separately, similarly, and at the same length. Ovid is notoriously liable to it. In Tyrtaeus it is so persistent (see for example even the extract selected by Lysurgus) that a volume of him would be scarcely tolerable, except as an alternative for the cane. And we may note by the way that, if the works of Tyrtaeus had been older than Archilochus, it would have been odd in Plato's Athenian to doubt whether a man of learning was acquainted with them, and ridiculous surely to doubt whether they had reached Crete. In reality it may be doubted rather whether indeed they had, though Plato, for the sake of his jest, chooses to suppose so. However, Plato read them; Aristotle read them, as he read everything, to make notes; and by some other Athenians it began to be thought, especially since Sparta was no longer the prime object of Athenian jealousy, that to have furnished their ancient rival with her favourite poet and educator, to have produced the Spartan Homer, should be counted to their city's credit. This is the sentiment played upon by Lysurgus. Also Tyrtaeus was thought good for the young, as was natural in societies which laid so much stress on military patriotism, though Plato naturally is dissatisfied with him even as a moralist, and 'examines' him very pertinently. But there is no sign (and indeed Plato goes to prove the contrary) that in the judgment of those times Tyrtaeus held any conspicuous rank. To this he was not advanced until it came to be known that his elegiacs and anapaests were nearly as old as the *Works and Days*. The manner of which remarkable discovery we will show, as briefly as possible, by way of conclusion.

It is by no means clear—and in such a case we ought certainly to give the benefit of the doubt—that the originator of the falsehood, about whose work, though lost, we happen to have uncommon full in-

formation, meant it to be taken seriously. The form and contents of his composition were such as in themselves to absolve him from responsibility to those who, pretending to write history, chose at their peril to borrow from him.² The 'Aristomeneis', as Grote appropriately calls the poem of Rhianus, was upon the face of it a mere romance, and if the author chose to enrich it with a figure called Tyrtaeus, chronology and science had really no claim to interfere. The only 'sources', which could be of much use to him in such a composition, would be, as was said before, the popular tales of Messenia; and that his 'Tyrtaeus' came thence is at any rate probable, for the adviser of Sparta was made ridiculous both in person and character.³ If in such tales, as may be presumed, the personages of legend and history were jumbled together with that fine freedom which belongs to the genus, it was not the business of a poet to sift or to correct them. To pronounce however a sure and just sentence on Rhianus we should need the text of his poem. What concerns us now is that, with or without excuse, he did as a fact illumine his picture of the olden times with hints reflected or refracted from the real history of the fifth century. And of this, as it happens, there is evidence quite apart from the introduction of Tyrtaeus. According to Rhianus, at the time when Aristomenes lived and fought, the king of Sparta was *Leotychides*.⁴ But here, as Pausanias gravely remarks, it was impossible to follow him, inasmuch as Leotychides, the successor of Demaratus, did not reign until many generations later. In fact, as Grote bids us observe, his reign almost extended, and his life may have actually extended, to the so-called 'third' Messenian war, since he was banished about B.C. 469. It seems scarcely dubitable that this is the explanation of the phenomenon which perplexed Pausanias;⁵ and wherever

² On the materials for the 'first' and 'second' Messenian wars, see Grote, part ii. chap. vii. Apart from Tyrtaeus, the only remark to which we may demur is that the account of Diodorus was 'very probably taken from Ephorus—though this we do not know'. Ephorus undoubtedly did much mischief to genuine history, but the fictions admitted by the compilers of the Roman period are in this case so wild that no one, I think, should be accused of a part in them without positive evidence. The only 'authorities' certainly traceable are Rhianus and Myron, both of whom appear to have been simply 'novelists', and scarcely deserve to be brought into court.

³ Pausanias 4, 15, 6; 4, 16, 1.

⁴ Paus. 4, 15, 1.

⁵ Pausanias is content simply to discard this particular trait of Rhianus, and to discover another

¹ *Laws* 629 B.

or however Rhianus came by his 'contemporary king Leotychides', there and so he naturally found his 'Tyrtaeus'. His fiction was not history, but it was innocent enough, and it should have been harmless.

Unfortunately it was with such materials as this that, in later ages, when fifth century and seventh were faded alike into objects of mere curiosity, the compilers of 'universal history' filled up the gaps in their scheme of fanciful chronology. At the present time, though it is but lately, their methods are well understood; and, bit by bit, much of their pretended restoration has been stripped from the scanty and broken masonry within. To discriminate the stages and dates of the plastering is not often possible, and is not so in the case before us. At the commencement of the Roman Empire, to which we must next descend, the epoch of Tyrtaeus was already fixed, as we see from Horace and Strabo, in accordance with Rhianus. Nor is this surprising. The tale of Rhianus seems to have been attractive; there is interest even in the bare abstract. Above all, it was a 'full' authority. Moreover, in regard to Tyrtaeus, it invested his extant poems with the fascination of a primeval document. With such a bribe, before such a tribunal as that of Diodorus, Rhianus might well have beaten Thucydides; but probably there was no contest and no adversary. The Spartans were not commonly historians; and by any one except a Spartan the 'third' Messenian war may well have been related, as it is by Thucydides, without mention of Tyrtaeus' name. A real search, no doubt, must have raised the question, and a sound criticism must have instantly decided it. The statement of Lycurgus stood where it stands now, and might probably have been reinforced by others now lost, though in those times not much, it seems, was thought of Tyrtaeus, and presumably not much said. Nor did it matter what had been said. Methodical history, seen in a glimpse between Thucydides and Aristotle, had long been lost again; among the notices of Tyrtaeus in late authors not one, I believe, cites even Lycurgus—whom indeed they might have actually read, as we have seen,

'contemporary king' on principles of his own. Others (see the spurious genealogy inserted in Herodotus 8, 31) preferred, it seems, to invent an earlier Leotychides.

without being much the wiser. Rhianus therefore and suchlike had it their own way, with the result that a versifier, whose real part in the development of Greek poetry is about as important as that of Mason in our own, was elevated to an antiquity not venerable merely but miraculous.

For although, to clear the way, we have hitherto acquiesced in the assumption that the Spartans in the seventh century used, or might have used, marches and elegies like those of Tyrtaeus, the evidence for that assumption is nothing more, or at least better, than the error about Tyrtaeus himself. To follow this matter, with all the subsidiary misconceptions, to the bottom would take us too far; but, for myself, I should as soon believe that *The Hind and Panther* was written by Gavin Douglas, as that in Lacedaemonia, a century before Solon, popular audiences were regaled with the full-formed classic style, neither archaic, nor personal, nor provincial, developed out of the Ionic epos by that 'greater Ionia' which included Athens. It is not certain that in B.C. 680 elegiacs had been written anywhere; but, if anywhere, it was in Ionian Asia, and there, we must suppose, not in a pruned, castigated, conventional vocabulary like that of Tyrtaeus. And indeed upon this head some passing scruples do seem to have visited the scholars of the Empire, and to have produced the eccentric hypothesis reported by Suidas, that Tyrtaeus was a native of Miletus: which however, if true, would not appreciably affect their problem. But for most minds there was no problem. Tyrtaeus, as we have noted, seems to have dealt mostly in commonplace, and scarcely at all with contemporary individuals, and therefore did not trouble Pausanias with anachronisms of positive fact, such anachronisms as were likely to trouble Pausanias. That the whole thing, in phrase and fashion, was one monstrous anachronism could naturally not be suspected by men who were accustomed to relate and to read, how, three hundred years before Solon, and about one hundred years (was it?) after Homer, the *Iliad* was brought to Sparta by her first legislator and appointed for recitation—one might suppose, at the Panathenaea.

A. W. VERRALL.

GAIUS GRACCHUS AND THE SENATE: NOTE ON THE EPITOME OF THE SIXTIETH BOOK OF LIVY.

THE epitomist of Livy, after mentioning the corn-law and the agrarian law as two of the 'perniciosas leges' of the younger Gracchus, goes on to describe a third in language which is curiously explicit. He writes thus: 'tertiam, qua equestrem ordinem tunc cum senatu consentientem corrumpere, ut sexcenti ex equite in curiam sublegerentur; et quia illis temporibus trecenti tantum senatores erant, sexcenti equites trecentis senatoribus admiscerentur; id est, ut equester ordo bis tantum virium in senatu haberet.'

This passage has been the subject of debate from the time of Sigonius and Manutius downwards, and it may seem audacious to make it the text of a fresh discussion. It has been found puzzling, partly because it is not confirmed by any ancient author, and partly because it is a known fact that for forty years after the death of Gracchus there was no material increase in the numbers of the senate. Some scholars have thought that the epitomist misunderstood Livy: some, that he was here confusing a reform of the senate and a reform of the judicia: and many¹ in recent times have set these words aside as incompatible with all we know of Gracchus' political aims,—a solution of the difficulty at once easy and arrogant. Others indeed have honestly faced the difficulty: e.g. Rein in Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*, and A.W. Zumpt in his work on the Roman criminal law. Mommsen dealt with the passage as long ago as 1843, and recognized that it cannot be set aside as a blunder or an invention of the epitomist. He saw in it an account of an earlier and milder plan for dealing with the burning question of the composition of the law-courts, which was afterwards superseded by the one with which we are all familiar; and this view he holds still, as may be seen in a note to vol. iii. of his *Staatsrecht*, p. 530.

My object in this paper is not to attempt a new solution; I am quite ready to accept Mommsen's as in part at least sufficient. I wish to point out why I think that historians and lecturers should consider the passage much more carefully than they are in the habit of doing, as bearing upon the original aims of Gracchus' statesmanship, and as throwing some light on the policy of later

statesmen. For a statesman is to be judged not only by what he achieves, but by what he would have achieved if he could; and it seems to me that we miss the finer vein in Gracchus if we persist in ignoring the attempt here indicated, just as we do in the younger Pitt if we think of him only as the instrument of a reactionary and warlike national feeling.

I propose then (1) to show that this passage is intrinsically credible: (2) to point out how the legislative proposal it records is one that we may naturally attribute to Gracchus: and (3) to compare this proposal with similar enactments of later legislators.

1. The text seems to be fully established. In early editions it was mutilated, to suit the preconceptions of scholars who had found difficulties in it: and even in the present century Götting proposed to read *decurias* instead of *curiam*, to make it refer to Gracchus' dealings with the law-courts. But this conjecture fails of its object unless the whole passage be altered: and the evidence of the MSS. is against any alteration. The meaning is as clear as daylight, and the epitomist seems to have taken special pains to make it so: he tells us in fact three times over that the effect of Gracchus' law was to give the equestrian body a majority of two-thirds in the senate-house. So explicit is the wording of the passage that it might almost seem to have been written to remove a misconception as to the nature of Livy's story.

We do not know who the epitomist was, nor when he wrote, nor whether he had before him Livy's work itself or an abridgment. But we do know that for the Gracchan period he did his work with some care, and had not yet wearied of it, as he seems to have done later on. Except in this particular passage, he agrees fairly well with what we know of the history from other sources; and here he has taken so much pains to make his divergence obvious, that we cannot well resist the conclusion that he is really reproducing something which he found in his original. His account conflicts here, it is true, with what we learn from Appian, Diodorus, Velleius, Tacitus, Florus, and the Pseudo-Asconius, who agree in making no mention of an increase of the senate, and tell us that Gracchus took away judicial functions from that body and gave them to the equites. But this is no good

¹ E.g. Götting, *Staatsverfassung*, p. 437, and Ihne, *History of Rome*, iv. 461.

reason for neglecting the epitomist's statement. He is here working on a part of Livy's history which was in all probability his best. We are far too apt to judge of Livy by his earlier decades, in which, from want of materials, he had frequently to draw on his own imagination or that of some predecessor: his work steadily advances in value as it proceeds, and in the period of the great wars contains an immense amount of valuable matter which even Polybius would never have thought of incorporating in his history. As he approached his own time, it is impossible that he should have gone hopelessly astray. While later writers like Appian were content to give a summary of the results of Gracchus' statesmanship, Livy, with abundant materials before him, must have written fully of the tribune's dealings both with senate and people, of the opposition he met with, the change in his plans, his temporary triumph, actual legislation, and sudden fall. He would be able to write as fully of Gracchus' views and measures as a historian of to-day can write of those of Pitt and Fox.

We have lost Livy, but we still have one full narrative of the Gracchi in the two lives of Plutarch, and here we come upon a statement which at once reminds us of the epitomist's. We cannot tell whether Plutarch knew Livy's account, and in any case it is not likely that he could have read Livy easily or correctly; but we may be certain that he took great pains in writing these excellent biographies, and that he used some good authority, probably a contemporary one. As his object was to describe the men and their ideas, rather than to give a historical abstract of what they accomplished, it is not surprising that he should have preserved, like the epitomist, a record which has been elsewhere lost. He tells us that Gaius passed a νόμος δικαστικός, the object of which was to transfer the δίκαι from the old senate to a mixed body of 300 senators and 300 equites. Here is at least the idea of an amalgamation of senate and equites for a particular purpose: in this essential point there is no discrepancy between him and the epitomist. True, Plutarch speaks of Gracchus as constituting new *judices* by this proposal, while the epitomist makes him constitute a new senate; but in my view this difference is not an essential one, and still less important is the difference in the numbers of the new body. Assuredly we have in each passage a reference to a leading idea in the statesman's mind, viz. an amalgamation for administrative purposes of

the two chief interests in the state.¹ In detail the two statements differ, but in spite of what has often been said to the contrary, they are by no means incompatible. If equites were to be added to the senate, as Livy says, the mixed body would undoubtedly have supplied the *album judicum*, which is practically what Plutarch says. Plutarch may have blundered as to the number, or he may be alluding to a second form of the proposal; but it is clear that he and the epitomist are both on the same track, and reveal to us a project of statesmanship which those who would understand the true aims of Gracchus cannot afford to neglect. Yet historians still insist on neglecting it; they seem to echo the quaint lament of Drakenborch, 'Mihi quidem Platoniciis numeris obscurior lex ista, et quonam spectet non intelligo.'

2. The question 'quonam spectet' seems to me answerable without difficulty. I venture to think that this law shows us the true and natural bent of Gracchus' statesmanship in the first year at least of his tribuneship. I have long noticed that students run away with the idea that Gracchus tried to overthrow the senate and to dispense with it entirely: not being duly instructed by their authorities, ancient or modern, to distinguish between the senate as a political institution and the senate as the organ of a narrow social oligarchy. It is hardly necessary to point out that no Roman statesman worthy of the name ever thought of dispensing with the senate as a political institution; and this is abundantly plain in the case of Gracchus. Plutarch, who had already told us that it is a mistake to think of him as a mere demagogue, describes him, even at the height of his power, as still working with the senate; overcoming its obstinacy, proposing measures which were honourable to it, and persuading it, in a certain matter of which he specifies the details, to do an act of justice to provincials.² This striking passage is often neglected, but it bears the stamp of truth, and must have come from some good source. If further evidence were necessary, it can be found in Gracchus' law *de provinciis consul-*

¹ It may be objected that the motive which the epitomist attributes to Gracchus does not fall in with this view: '*qua equestrem ordinem tunc cum senatu consentientem corrumpere.*' But (1) the attribution of a motive is of very different value from the statement of a fact: and (2) in any case this law would have destroyed the monopoly of power possessed by the nobility, through the agency of the equites. It is in this light that Plutarch represents Gracchus himself as regarding it.

² *Vita C. Gracchi*, ch. 6.

aribus, by which an important administrative function is still reserved to the senate as a permanency. The real object of Gracchus was of course not to dispense with the senate, but to make it a body with which a reforming statesman could work; not to overthrow the existing constitution, but to modify it in one or two vital points to suit altered circumstances and to meet the difficult problems of the time.

He must have known well enough, long before he entered upon office, that there were two great obstacles to any effective reforming legislation; and the reluctance to stand for the tribunate, of which Plutarch informs us so distinctly, may have been due to his sense of the difficulty of overcoming them. The first was the resistance of a senate which was the organ of a selfish oligarchical class, a senate which acquitted guilty proconsuls and resisted economical reform; the second was the caprice of an almost equally self-regarding *plebs urbana*. The first of these barriers Gracchus sought to break down by the law of which the epitomist has preserved for us a record; a law which would increase the numbers of the great council and widen its interests, so as to constitute it a body tolerably free from class prejudices. The second he would have overcome by his *lex de civitate*, giving the *civitas* to the Latins, and perhaps going even further in this direction; thus increasing and widening the constituent body, as he would have increased and widened the senate. Taken in this light these two laws stand in the closest relation to one another, and have practically the same object; they may have been promulgated in successive years (though that is by no means certain), but they are, if I am not mistaken, the two cardinal points in the true Gracchan statesmanship. The rest of his legislation fails to show the same statesmanlike quality; some of it at least is the work of a man disappointed, perhaps angered, whose methods become tortuous and dangerous in the face of unreasoning and successful opposition.

3. This great double project of reform, the first attempt to act upon the obvious fact that the republic had outgrown the institutions of its childhood, was at the time a failure. But it reappears, as we should expect, in the hands of the next unquestionably intelligent statesman. Whatever may have been the motives of Livius Drusus the younger, the two leading features in his pro-

posed legislation stand out clearly, and they are identical with those of Gracchus' original scheme. He proposed to enlarge the senate,¹ and to extend the *civitas*. Gracchus' later plan for curbing the oligarchical monopoly of power had produced bad results in the *repetundae* court: Drusus desired to put an end to these by reverting to the original Gracchan policy. It is not impossible that this policy may have been recommended to him by his father, the rival of Gracchus in his second tribunate; for both seem to have belonged to that intelligent section of the nobility which, like Scipio, believed profoundly in the senate as an institution, while they distrusted more or less both ultra-oligarchs and *plebs urbana*; and it may be that the elder Drusus, whose motives are possibly misrepresented, only began to oppose Gracchus when he saw the true policy abandoned for makeshifts.

After the death of Drusus and the Social War, one half of that policy was realized by the enfranchisement of Italy; the other half Sulla shortly afterwards found himself compelled by force of circumstances to adopt. The senate was enlarged, but only when it was too late to find new and wholesome material for enlarging it. Yet the last and the greatest of the successors of Gracchus once more adopted the Gracchan plan on a more extended scale; Caesar increased the senate to the number originally proposed, according to the epitomist, by Gracchus, and opened the doors of the senate-house to provincials; while at the same time he made this reform run parallel, as Gracchus had wished to do, with a fresh extension of the *civitas*.

I have only been able in this paper to present in bare outline the view I wish to enforce. But I may have said enough to satisfy some readers that if this statement of the epitomist be set aside or neglected, we are liable to misunderstand Gracchus, and to underestimate the influence which he exercised on the minds of later legislators. We see in his work nothing but a curious *mélange* of good designs and bad results, if we fail to bear in mind that in the two cardinal points of his policy he was before his time, and found himself compelled to abandon them for indifferent substitutes.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

¹ Appian *B. C.* i. 35; the new members were to be 300. In this case the epitomist only mentions an amalgamation of the orders in equal numbers as *judices*. Liv. *epit.* 70.

EMENDATIONS OF PHILO DE SACRIFICANTIBUS.

THE tradition of this treatise in the Greek MSS. is very imperfect and in spite of Thomas Mangey's many brilliant conjectures (which I add in brackets) the text remains full of faults and lacunae. The following emendations are based upon the old Armenian version, printed at Venice in 1892. In this version the treatise begins only with § 5 (= Mangey's ed. vol. 2, p. 254, 45) of the Greek treatise, giving in place of the words τὰ ἄλλα τὰ περὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον the fresh title Φιλωνος τὰ κ.τ.λ.

Mang. 255, 9...ἐπισκεπτέον πρὸς ἀλήθειαν. Τοῦ θεοῦ θυσιαστήριόν ἐστιν ἡ εὐχάριστος τοῦ σοφοῦ ψυχῇ παγέισα ἐκ τελείων ἀριθμῶν ἀτηγῶν καὶ ἀδιαφρέτων.

In the above Arm. places the full stop after ἐπισκεπτέον and reads ἀρετῶν for ἀριθμῶν.

[Mang. : quidni ἀρετῶν, ob sequentia ?]

255, 15. ὅπερ γὰρ αἰσθητὸν φῶς εἰς ὀφθαλμοὺς, τοῦτ' ἐπιστήμη λογισμῶ πρὸς θεωρίαν τῶν ἀσωμάτων.

After ὀφθαλμοὺς Arm. adds: 'ad apprehensionem corporum,' perhaps = πρὸς κατάληψιν σωμάτων; and such an addition is required to balance πρὸς θεωρ. τ. ἀσ.

255, 27, § 6. καίτοι τῶν κρεῶν ἀναλισκομένων ὑπὸ πυρὸς, ὡς εἶναι σαφειστάτην πίστιν, ὅτι οὐ τὰ ἱερεῖα θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν ὑπολαμβάνει τοῦ καθιόντος, ἵνα ἡ μόνιμον καὶ βέβαιον ἐξ ἀρετῆς.

What underlies is of course the thought that the true sacrifice is a broken and a contrite heart; but why ἵνα ἡ κ.τ.λ. ? Read with Arm. καθιόντος εἶναι, ἐν ἣ τὸ μόν. κ.τ.λ.

255, 33. μηδέτερον ἀξίων διαφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

'Melius προσφέρειν' wrote Mangey and the Arm. confirms his conjecture.

256, 12. Εἰ δὲ ὁ τῶν ὁλῶν Κτίστης...μεταδίδωσί σοι τῆς ἡλίου δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐνδείας ἀναπληρῶν αἰς κέχρωσαι.

Here αἰς κέχρωσαι is impossible. The Arm. renders 'quibus oportet te uti.' Therefore read αἰς κέχρησαι, 'the wants, in which you are needy.'

256, 20. ἰσότητός τε καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελείσθαι, ἀποβαλλόμενον τὴν αἰσιν...κακίαν.

Here Arm. adds ἄλλης before ἀρετῆς [Mang. : Forsan deest ἄλλης uel ἀπάσης] and implies ἀποβαλλόμενον which is more in accordance with Philonean usage.

256, 31. Ἐτέρου δὲ τοῦ καὶ νύκτωρ ἀδελφόν τι καὶ συγγενὲς ταῖς μεθμεριναῖς θυσίαις

ἐπιτελεῖσθαι πρὸς ἀρεσκίαν θεοῦ, καὶ μηδὲνα χρόνον ἢ καιρὸν εὐχαριστίας παραλείπειν ἐπιτηδεύατον καὶ προσφύεσταν τῇ νυκτί. θυσίαν γὰρ αὐτὴν καλεῖν τὴν τοῦ ἱερωτάτου φέγγους ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτοις αὐγῇ.

Philo is stating his second reason for a lamp being kept burning in the sanctuary from evening till dawn. But τῇ νυκτί is awkward for it is not the χρόνος ἢ καιρός which naturally suits the night, but the burning of a lamp which does so. The Arm. has a full stop after ἐπιτηδεύατον and then continues in this sense: Et natura aptum in nocte sacrificium huius oblationis. Sacrificium enim id oportet uocare, etc. Therefore begin fresh clause and add ἡ θυσία or similar after τῇ νυκτί.

257, 23. Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν αὐτῶν ὄρων ἕκαστον ἴδρυνται εὐθὺς, ἐφ' οἷς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησεν ὅτε ἐτάχθη.

What Philo meant to say here is well expressed in Mangey's Latin rendering: Manent igitur horum singula intra praestitutos sibi ab initio, quando composita sunt, fines. But this the Greek does not say.

The Arm. has the following sense: ...fixum est quibus super statim ab initio quo tempore fiebat, quodeunque dispositum est. Probably εὐθὺς and ὅτε came to be misplaced, and the latter to stand both before and after ἐποίησεν, in the latter position being changed into ὅτι. Therefore reconstruct thus: ἴδρυνται, ἐφ' οἷς εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὅτε ἐποίησεν, ἐτάχθη.

257, 38. σύμπας ὁ κόσμος, ὃ τε ὁρατὸς καὶ ἀόρατος καὶ ἀσώματος, τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Read with the Arm. ὃ τε ὁρατὸς καὶ ὁ ἀσώματος, τὸ π. τοῦ ὁρατοῦ. [Mangey notes: οὐρανοῦ. Melius, ut uidetur, ὁρατοῦ.]

258, 4. σκιρτῶντες αὐθαδῶς καὶ ἀποσχοινίζοντες. 'Melius ἀπαυχεύοντες' wrote Mangey and the Arm. supports his conjecture.

258, 28, § 10. τὸ ταπεινὸν τῶν λεχθέντων ἀξιοῖ προνομίαν. The Arm. has προνομίας προνοίας. [Mang. : scribe προνοίας.]

258, 33. Ἰκέται δὲ καὶ θεραπευταὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἀξίως ὄντες. Arm. omits ἀξίως. [Mang. : Forsan redundat ἀξίως, uel scribendum ἀληθῶς.]

258, 46. λογισάμενος ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμέτοχα ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τ' ἀγαθὸν φύσεως· ἔπειτα δὲ, ὅτι καὶ βεβαίαν ἔχει τὴν μεταβολὴν, μαραινόμενα τρόπον τινα πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι βεβαίως· καὶ τῆς ἰκεσίας αὐτοῦ περιεχόμεθα.

Here the transition to καὶ τῆς ἰκεσίας is

very abrupt and the Arm. reveals a lacuna in the Greek text, for after *βεβαίως* it proceeds thus: *sed quod firmum est et immutabile et immotum bonum illud sequamur, et supplicationes eius et ministrationes amplectamur.*

259, 21. *παιδευόμενοι τὰ κάλλιστα ἀνδράσι.*

Mang. renders: *doctrina imbuti quae uiros maxime deceat*, but Arm. = *imbuti quae optima apud diuinos homines et deo deditos*. The reference is of course to the teaching of Israel by Moses and the prophets, and the corresponding words have dropped out of the Greek MSS.

259, 44. *Αἱ δὲ ἐκ προγόνων ἀφ' αἵματος αὐταὶ λεγόμεναι συγγένεια.*

For *αὐταὶ* the Arm. implies *αἱ*, which we must either read or correct to *τ'* *αἱ*.

260, 3. *φησὶ γὰρ Ὑῖοί ἐστε κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν (ἢ ὑμῶν) ὁ δηλονότι προνοίας καὶ κηδεμονίας αἰσθησόμενοι τῆς ὥς ἐκ πατρὸς. Ἡ δὲ ἐπιμέλεια τοσοῦτον ἰδίους τοῖς ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ὅσον περ οἶμαι καὶ ὁ ἐπιβουλευόμενος, διαφέρει.*

The Arm. renders the last clause thus: *sed cura horum tanta abundantia excellat eam quae ex hominibus quantâ censeo et is qui curans est excellat.*

[This virtually confirms Mangey's conjecture: 'Forsan scribendum *ιδίας τῆς scil. ἐπιμελείας*. Mox etiam pro *ἐπιβουλευόμενος*, *repono ἐπιμελόμενος*.]

260, 10, § 12. *οὐκ ἀξίων τοὺς ἐν τοιαύτῃ πολιτείᾳ τραφέντας ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ μυστικῶν πραγμάτων ἐκκρεμαμένους ὀλιγορεῖν ἀληθείας.*

Philo refers to Moses' prohibition to Jews to initiate themselves in heathen mysteries. The Arm. implies: *...πολιτεία ἐγγραφέντας ὀργιάζεσθαι καὶ μυθικῶν πλασμάτων ἐκκ.* [Mang.: *Omnino ὀργιάζεσθαι quod etiam uisum Doctiss. Cotelier. Monum. Eccl. Graec. ... Quidni uero μυθικῶν πλασμάτων?*]. *ἐγγραφέντας* alone Mangey failed to conjecture; and it is less essential to the passage, though undoubtedly the correct reading.

260, 18. *Τί γὰρ εἰ καλὰ ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ὧ μῦσται, καὶ συμφέροντα, συγκλεισάμενοι ἐάντους ἐν σκότῳ βαθεῖ, τρεῖς ἢ τέτταρας μόνους ὠφελείτε.*

For *ἐάντους* the Arm. renders in the sense 'during two years,' *biennales*. Therefore add *δύ' ἐνιαυτούς* in the Greek text, the reference being to the length of the period of initiation. The novice was granted the *ἐποπτεία* in the second year only of his admission. In the Greek text the words were lost through homoioteleuton.

260, 4, 2. *καρπῶν ἀμυθῆτων ἰδέας.*

Arm. implies *ἀμυθῆτους* [Mang. *melius ἀμυθῆτους*].

261, 1. *τοῖς ἀξίοις ἐπ' ὠφελεία.*

Arm. involves *ἐπωφελείας* [Mang. *melius ἐπωφελείας*].

261, 19. *τῶν νοσοῦντων τὴν ἀληθῆ νόσον, ἀνδρογύνων.*

For *ἀληθῆ* Arm. has *θήλειαν* [Mang.: *Repono θήλειαν*].

261, 25. *Ἐλαύνει δ' οὐ μόνον πόρνας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς πόρνῃς ἐπιφερομένους μητρῶν αἰσχος, διὰ τὸ τὴν πρώτῃν σπορὰν καὶ γένεσιν αὐτοῖς κεκιβδηλεύσθαι. τύπος γὰρ οὗτος, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος ἐπιδέχεται ἀλληγορίαν, φιλοσόφον θεωρίας ὦν ἀνάπλεως. τῶν γὰρ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἀνοσίων οὐχ εἰς τρόπον, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ διαφέροντες.*

The context here and also the subsequent course of the argument (e.g. 262, 16 *καθὰ γὰρ ὦν μητέρες πόρναι, τὸν μὲν ἀληθῆ πατέρα οὐκ ἴσασιν κ.τ.λ.*) involves some reference after *κεκιβδηλεύσθαι* to the fact that a prostitute's children have no one father and that none of them know their father. Even so, he says, idolaters ignore the one true god (*ἀγνοοῦντες τὸν ἕνα καὶ ἀληθινὸν θεόν* 262, 20). The Arm. must therefore be held to have preserved the true text, for after *κεκιβδηλεύσθαι* it indicates a lacuna in the Greek which it thus fills up: *et inter se confusio est propter multitudinem eorum qui cognoverunt matres, adeo ut nequeant uerum patrem certo agnoscere et dignoscere*. In the Greek then there stood something like this: *τό τε συγκέχυται διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μητράσιν ὠμολογῶτων, ὡς καὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ πατέρα μὴ γινώσκειν.*

261, 34. *τὴν ἀναγκασιότατην οὐσίαν ἐκ τῶν ὄντων ἀναιροῦντες, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀρχέτυπον παράδειγμα πάντων, ὅσα ποιότητες οὐσίας καθ' ἣν ἕκαστον εἰδωποιεῖται καὶ διαμετρεῖται.*

For the last word Mangey writes: *Melius, ut uidetur, περατοῦται*, for *ποιότης* limits, but does not *measure* matter. The Arm. restores the text thus: *ὅσα ποιότητες ἢ ποιότητες, καθ' ἣν κ.τ.λ.* Thus *οὐσίας* is corrupt.

261, 40. *οὕτως ἡ ἀναιροῦσα δόξα ἰδέας, πάντα συγχέει καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνωτέραν τῶν στοιχείων οὐσίαν τὴν ἀμορφίαν, ἀπὸ σκηνῶν ἄγει.*

Mangey corrects *οὐσίας* to *οὐσίαν* and writes of *ἀπὸ σκ. ἄ.*: '*omnino mendose scribitur. Forsan haud ingenti literarum et soni discrepantia καὶ σύγχυσις εἰσηγείται.*' The Arm. however restores the true text and involves the following... *τῶν στοιχείων οὐσίαν τὴν ἀμορφίαν καὶ ἀποιότητα ἐκεῖνα ἄγει.*

Perhaps, as Philo uses *ἀποιος* elsewhere and not *ἀποιότης*, and also avoids hiatus, we should rather read *καὶ τὸ ἀποιον ἐκεῖν' ἄγει* (or *ἀνάγει*).

261, 45. *οὐ γὰρ ἦν θέμις ἀπείρον καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἱδμονα καὶ μακάριον.*

The Arm. has *φερομένης* or *φορουμένης* for *πεφυρμένης*, either of which agrees with

Philo's diction elsewhere, and for ἰδμονα it has εὐδαίμονα [Mang. melius εὐδαίμονα].

262, 2. Ἐτεροι δὲ...προσυνπερβάλλουσιν, ἅμα ταῖς ἰδέαις καὶ πρὸς ὑπαρξιν θεοῦ ἐπικαλυπτόμενοι ὡς οὐκ ὄντος, λεγομένου δὲ εἶναι χάριν τοῦ συμφέροντος ἀνθρώποις. Οἱ δὲ δι' εὐλάβειαν τοῦ δοκοῦντος πάντα παρῆναι καὶ πάντα καθορᾶν, ἄγονοι μὲν σοφίας, ἐπιτηδεύοντες δὲ τὴν μεγίστην κακιῶν ἀθεότητα, τρίτοι δὲ εἰσιν, οἱ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔτεμον· εἰσηγησάμενοι πλῆθος ἀρρένων τε καὶ θηλειῶν...πολυαρχίας λόγων τὸν κόσμον ἀναπλήσαντες.

That the above is somehow wrong Mangey felt, when he proposed to place a full stop ἀθεότητα and then to proceed τρίτοι δὲ. Philo is distinguishing in the context several degrees of impiety. There are first those who declare the bodiless ideas to be a mere name devoid of reality. These he has characterized in the passage 261, 32 beginning οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἀσωμάτους ἰδέας. The second set are those who for police reasons pretend that there is a god. These he characterizes in the passage beginning 262, 2 ἔτεροι δέ. Now these would, according to Mangey's suggested emendation, be the same as the third set (τρίτοι δὲ). But this third set are pure polytheists and not atheistical simulators of a belief in a single god.

The Arm. accordingly reveals a lacuna in the Greek MSS. after καθορᾶν, which it fills up somewhat as follows, omitting δι' before εὐλάβειαν:—Οἱ δὲ εὐλάβειαν τοῦ δοκοῦντος πάντα παρῆναι καὶ πάντα καθορᾶν [ἀκοιμήτοις ὁμμασιν κατεσκεύασαν, τοῦ arcere ἑαυτοὺς ἀπ' ἀδικίας. Τούτους ὁ νόμος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀποκεκομμένους καλεῖ, πᾶσας τὰς γεννητικὰς τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀποκόψαντας ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ὑπολήψεις], ἄγονοι μὲν σοφίας κ.τ.λ.

What word stood for arcere in the Greek I cannot conjecture, for καλύειν ἑαυτὸν ἀδικίας = 'to screen oneself from injustice' is hardly Philonian. Anyhow, thus restored, the passage makes good sense.

The Arm. also omits πρὸς before ὑπαρξιν, which is better. It was either carried over from προσυνπερβάλλοντες or belongs to ἐπικαλυπτόμενοι. After πλῆθος it also adds θεῶν, which has dropt out of the Greek MSS.; and has λόγῳ for λόγοις, both to the great improvement of the sense.

262, 22. περὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῶν ὄντων.

The Arm. implies ἀναγκαϊότητα [Mang. melius, ut uidetur, ἀναγκαϊότατον].

262, 23. ὅπερ ἡ τέλος μόνον ἢ πρῶτον.

Arm. omits τέλος [Mang.: dele τέλος cum desit in MSS. et omnino redundet].

262, 26. τετάρτους δὲ καὶ πέμπτους ἐλαίνει.

Arm. adds τούτους after δὲ, which the Greek seems to need.

262, 35. τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ βασιλείαν τῶν ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων ἀνάγουσιν αὐτῷ.

The Arm. involves ἀνάπτουσιν [Mang.: Forsan ἀνάπτουσιν].

262, 39. καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα εἰκότι στοχασμῷ ἀνοσιοῦσθαι.

Instead of ἀνοσιοῦσθαι the Arm. has: prae-imaginari et in animo uoluer. Some codd. have ἀφοσιοῦσθαι. Therefore correct to φαντασιοῦσθαι. [Mang.: quidni uero ἀφεικ-άσασθαι?]

262, 42. οὗτος ὁ τὸν οὐρανὸν κατασκευάσας, καὶ τὴν χέρσου φύσιν παντὸς λόγου ἐπινοίας κρείττοσι πλωτῇν ἐργασάμενος.

For οὐρανὸν Arm. has ναῦν simply [Mang.: quidni enim a Philone scriptum ναῦν οὐριόδρμον?].

After ἐργάσαμενος the Arm. also reveals a lacuna in the Greek MSS. which it fills up as follows: 'hominem. et uias per mare πολυσχιδεῖς et πολυίχρους usque ad portum. Qui ex urbe in urbem et cursuum (ὁ οὐρῶ δρόμῳ) ὁδὸν ἔτεμε λεώφορον, et cognita fecit ἡπειρώταις τὰ νησιώτων; nusquam conuenissent nisi nauigium susceptum fuisset. Hocce erat operariorum et clarissimorum artificum inuentio supradictorum.'

262, 45. παιδείαν ἐπενόησε καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἡγάγεν.

After ἐπενόησε Arm. adds καὶ ἡὔξησε or καὶ συνῆύξησε.

263, 7, § 15. οἱ δὲ τῶν αἰσθήσεων προστάται τὸν ἔπαινον αὐτῶν εὖ μάλα στενοποιοῦσι.

Arm. has σεμνοποιοῦσι [Mang.: omnino repone σεμνοποιοῦσι].

263, 12. αἱ τῶν σιτίων τροφαί.

After σιτίων Arm. adds καὶ ποτῶν.

263, 30. εἰς τε τὴν οἰκεῖον καὶ ἀλλοτριῶν καὶ φίλων διάκρισιν καὶ βλαβερῶν μὲν φυγῇν, αἶρεσιν δὲ ἐπωφελῶν.

After φίλων Arm. adds: et inimicorum = καὶ ἐχθρῶν, which has certainly dropt out of the Greek MSS., being needed to complete the symmetry of the Greek sentence.

263, 40. οἱ μῖτε χερσὶ μῖτε ποσὶ δύνανται κατὰ τὸ βέλτιον, τὴν πρόσρησιν ἐπαληθεύειν, ἦν...θέσθαι φασὶ τοὺς προτέρους, ἀδυνάτους ὀνομάσαντες θανμασιώτατα. 'Ἡ ἀκοὴ δὲ χρήμα δι' ἧς μέλη καὶ ῥυθμοὶ καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα κατὰ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐπικρίνεται. 'Ωδὴ γὰρ καὶ λόγος ὑγιεινὰ καὶ σωτήρια φάρμακα, κ.τ.λ.

In the above the Arm. enables us to correct ἐπαληθεύειν, which hung in the air, to ἐπαληθεύοντες; then ὀνομάσαντες to ὀνομασάντας—a correction which Mangey had foreseen.

Next the Arm. reveals several lacunae in the Greek text for it proceeds thus:.... ὀνομάσαντας [simul enim cum oculorum destructione (i.e. πηρώσει) etiam corporis uirtutes non modo laqueo captae labuntur,

sed etiam destruuntur.] θανμασιωτάτη δὲ ἡ ἀκοὴ δι' ἧς μέλη καὶ ῥυθμοὶ [et compages, transitiones, harmoniae et concordiae uocum et generum et coetuum gregum] καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα κατὰ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐπικρίνεται [ἡ λόγων προφορικῶν παμπλήθῃ εἶδη, δικανικῶν, βουλευτικῶν, ἐγκωμιαστικῶν; etiam eorum qui ex antiqua historia sunt, et in concionibus publicis; uel in necessariis de iis quae ad uitam spectant, de iis quae τὸν αἰῶνα (!) tangunt. Nam cum uniuerse uox nostra duplicem habeat uirtutem loquendi et canendi, duo illa aures seligunt definiunt pro commodo animae] Ὡδὴ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.

The Greek text has here been considerably mutilated.

264, 3. ἀφροσύνας καὶ ἀδίκιαις.

Arm. has ἀφρ. κ. ἀδικίαις. [Mang.: melius, forsan, ἀδικίαις.]

264, 6, § 16. οἷ τε τοῦ νοῦ θιασῶται καὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, οἱ μὲν ἐκείνων, οἱ δὲ ταύτην θεοπλαστοῦσιν.

Arm. has ταύτας for ταύτην [Mang.: omnino scribe ταύτας].

264, 25. Ὅντως γὰρ οἱ μὲν ἄθλιοι τὰς ψυχὰς τεθνῶσιν.

Arm. has ἄθελι for ἄθλιοι, [Mang.: Ex contextu reponendum uidetur ἄθελι.]

In the above notes I have only noticed such variants on the part of the version as are essential to the Greek text. Neutral variants I have passed over. They abundantly confirm the opinion formed by Dr. P. Wendland of Thomas Mangey's great critical skill. Philo is an unjustly neglected writer. For example, there is left us from antiquity no finer or more pertinent and instructive criticism of the mysteries than that which this treatise contains, yet who of the many modern writers, who deal with this subject, has noticed it? For this reason, and because the Greek tradition of it is singularly imperfect, I have chosen the *de Sacrificantiis* as an example of the critical utility of an old Armenian version.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

THE TREBBIA AND LAKE TRASIMENE IN MESSRS. HOW & LEIGH'S ROMAN HISTORY.

THE *Roman History* recently issued by Messrs. How and Leigh seems so good that it is likely to be largely used. This very fact, however, must serve as a provocation to any one who feels that the views expressed in the book are open to criticism, more especially if those views are expressed in a portion of the work which is likely to be of peculiar interest to those for whom it is intended. The special point to which I refer is the account of Hannibal's operations in Italy from the time of the passage of the Alps to the battle of Lake Trasimene. The subject would be of much less importance did it not necessarily affect the view which must be taken of Polybius and Livy as military historians. Messrs. Leigh and How follow Polybius' account of the operations up to the time of the retreat of Scipio from the Ticinus to Placentia. After this, in dealing with the campaign in North Italy they diverge from both Polybius and Livy, and this apparently without adequate reason.

Briefly put, their view seems to be:—

(1) That Scipio's first camp after his retreat from the Ticinus was on the left or west bank of the Trebbia, i.e. on the opposite bank to Placentia (p. 185).

(2) That connection with the right or east bank was maintained by a bridge, possibly of boats (p. 185).

(3) That the river Trebbia flows in winter with a strong and turbulent flood (p. 185).

(4) That the second camp occupied by Scipio was on the right or east bank of the river on a spur of the Apennines (p. 183). (Quite a different view is stated, not apparently as an alternative, on p. 185.)

(5) That, consequently, the actual battle took place on the left or west bank.

These statements are so inter-dependent that it is impossible to discuss them quite separately.

If the remark about the Trebbia is intended to convey the meaning that it is during the winter season in a continuous state of strong and turbulent flood, it is incorrect. The water is frequently low during the winter. The rise and fall of so quick a stream is, of course, rapid and liable to frequent variation. Furthermore it may reasonably be concluded that before the day of the battle the stream was low and easily passable, for on that day the Romans crossed it, although swollen by a rain storm which had occurred during the previous night (Polyb. iii. 72, 4). The

existence of the bridge is, of course, a pure supposition. Neither Polybius nor Livy hint at such a thing, and yet the former mentions the fact that Scipio constructed a bridge over the Ticinus (P. iii. 60, 1), and speaks of the bridge over the Padus at Placentia (P. iii. 66, 3). But if there was a bridge, it can hardly have been one of boats. A real winter freshet on the Trebbia would have swept such a construction away incontinently. But whether there was a bridge or not, is it in the slightest degree likely that Scipio would have retired to Placentia with a view to 'his forces having a secure position to rest upon' (P. iii. 66, 9), and then have taken up a position with a river like the Trebbia between him and his *point d'appui*? At the season of the year at which the events took place a sudden rise of the river might at any time render his communication with Placentia impossible, or, even supposing the imaginary bridge were there, what would have been his position in case Hannibal defeated him in this river angle with only this one narrow line of retreat? His army must have been annihilated. And yet Messrs. How and Leigh assert that 'all strategical considerations go to prove that the first position of Scipio would be in front of the Trebbia' (i.e. on the left bank). Surely the exact opposite of this is the case. Even if the subsequent account of the battle and what followed were not conclusive on this point, every consideration of strategy would point to the space of land between the Trebbia and Placentia as the position of the first Roman camp. Scipio would then have had the line of the Trebbia on his front instead of his rear and would be in immediate touch with his *point d'appui*.

The authors of this history make two statements which it is impossible to reconcile with one another as to the position of the second camp of the Romans:—

(1) On p. 183 (*ad fin.*) they say that 'Scipio took up a stronger position on a spur of the Apennines, covered by the mountain torrent,' i.e. the Trebbia.

This is, it must be remembered, on the right or east bank according to their view. The position would be eight and a half miles, as the crow flies, from Placentia.

(2) On p. 185 they say, 'He (Scipio) then crossed the stream, and protected by it, rested his right on the fortress, his left on the Apennines.'

This is quite a different position from the first mentioned. It covers the low-lying

alluvial ground between Placentia and the position first mentioned.

The first position stated does at any rate satisfy what are evidently the main motives of this part of the history of events, Scipio's recognition of the fact that the manifest superiority of Hannibal's cavalry made it dangerous for him to remain in the plain, and his desire not to risk all in a pitched battle. The second, of course, eminently fails to satisfy these conditions, and as it is not only unsupported by the evidence of the original authorities but is in disaccord with what they do tell us of the movement, it can hardly serve any genuine historical purpose.

As far as the question is affected by the revolt of the Celts in the Roman camp (P. iii. 67, 1-7), it may be said, at any rate, that the action of these Celts would point to their being from the west rather than from the east of the Trebbia, for to the east of this stream the land would be at the time of the revolt, i.e. when the Romans were in camp 1, practically at the mercy of the Roman army. If this were so, then prior to this outbreak the Celts west of that river were divided in their allegiance, for some, at any rate, of them, viz. those in the neighbourhood of the place where Hannibal effected his crossing of the Padus, had entered into friendly relations with the Carthaginians, and it is consequently possible that Scipio's movement may have been partly instigated by his desire to overawe those Celts to the west of the Trebbia who had hitherto been neutral, if not loyal, into a continuance of this attitude. This would presume a move on his part from the east to the west side of that river. This change for the worse in the attitude of the Celts emphasized the necessity of a move to a more secure position, where cavalry could not be used, to some such position in fact as Messrs. How and Leigh indicate on p. 183. But was this position on the right or left of the Trebbia? Messrs. How and Leigh say the right or east side. They admit that Livy's account will not square with this view. They admit, too, that Polybius' account agrees in the main with Livy's. If they throw over Polybius and Livy to what authority do they appeal? Apparently it is to their own view of what would have been the best strategical course which Scipio could have adopted under the circumstances. Unfortunately strategy is controlled by circumstances, and in this case the circumstances were such as to compel Scipio to adopt a policy of masterly inactivity in a

secure position. As to Polybius' account it seems to make one or two things quite clear:—

(1) The battle was fought at some point in the course of the Trebbia where there was high ground on one side of the stream and ground on which cavalry could act on the other. There is only one part of the river course where this consideration is fulfilled and that requires the second Roman camp on the west or left side of the stream. (The detail is given in the *Journal of Philology*, July, 1895.)

(2) Messrs. How and Leigh's theory would demand that the battle took place on the left or west side of the river.

But it is clear that Polybius understood it to have taken place on the same side of the Trebbia as Placentia, for he says (P. iii. 75) that the Romans who cut their way through the Carthaginian ranks, though they saw those on their own wings hard pressed, τὸ μὲν ἐπιβοηθεῖν τοῖς ἡ πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀπέναι παρεμβολὴν ἀπέγνωσαν, ὑφορώμενοι μὲν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἱππέων, κωλύμενοι δὲ διὰ τὸν ποταμὸν καὶ τὴν ἐπιφορὰν καὶ συστροφὴν τοῦ κατὰ κεφαλὴν ὄμβρου, τηροῦντες δὲ τὰς τάξεις ἀθρόοι μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἀπεχώρησαν εἰς Πλακεντίαν, &c. Here we see that they did *not* go back to the camp because that would have necessitated crossing the river. But had they been on the left or west side they must have crossed the river to reach Placentia. Again, had that imaginary bridge been more than imaginary, surely we should have had some mention of it here. So far from that, we are told that these Romans maintained the order in which they had fought during their retreat, which could not have been the case had they had to cross a bridge roadway. Polybius, then, certainly thought that the battle took place on the east side of the Trebbia, and we know, at any rate, that Polybius had peculiar opportunities for ascertaining the real facts of the case. Livy admittedly takes the same view. Messrs. How and Leigh do not.

The block on which they stumble seems to be the omission on the part of the two ancient authors to account for the possibility of Sempronius' junction with Scipio. But though Polybius does not account for this in express words, yet he gives us something more than a clue to what may be the explanation, when, after describing the junction, he proceeds immediately to give an account of Hannibal's capture of Clastidium, some distance west of the Trebbia, commencing with the words κατὰ δὲ τοὺς

αὐτοὺς καιροὺς, &c. Hannibal may then have been engaged at Clastidium when Sempronius came up. Even if he were not, the latter might well have joined Scipio by avoiding the plain and keeping to the foot hills of the Apennines, and furthermore the Celts on the east of the Trebbia, whose attitude towards the Carthaginians seems to have been of a very doubtful character (P. iii. 69, 5, 6), would probably screen Sempronius' approach.

The geography of the region through which Hannibal marched from the northern plain to Faesulae is evidently not known to Polybius and Livy save in the merest outline, and the line of Hannibal's march can be little more than conjectured, and that not with anything approaching to certainty; still the coast track from Liguria to the lower Arno seems to agree most closely with the vague details we have at our disposal, especially with Livy's remark that Hannibal after the engagement with Sempronius (xxi. 59) retired to Liguria.

After seeing the region of Lake Trasimene, it seems to me impossible to doubt that Messrs. How and Leigh are right in adopting the north rather than the east site for the battlefield. It is not, however, easy to understand how it is they fail to perceive that Polybius' description of the field and of the battle is in the main favourable to the view which they take. I say 'in the main' advisedly, because Polybius' description seems to demand that the battle took place, not in the long stretch of low land between Passignano and the passage round Monte Gualandro, but in the shorter space between Tuoro and the latter place. It may be doubted, too, to say the least of it, whether even the adventurous genius of Hannibal would not have shrunk from extending an army of the size of his along an arc which measured along the chord would be four and three-quarter miles, and along the arc itself some seven or eight miles. It is also to be noted that the lake shore at the time of the battle must have been much closer to the hill of Tuoro than it is at the present day. So extended a position as that demanded by Messrs. How and Leigh's theory seems to be incredible, though the distance along the road from Monte Gualandro to Tuoro, about two miles, seems too short for a force of the size of the Roman army when in marching order; yet we gather from the last section of Livy xxii. 4 that the fighting began on the front and flanks sooner than on the rear of the Roman column, which would

seem to indicate that the troops posted by Hannibal on Monte Gualandro had to hold back in order to let the Roman army get thoroughly involved in the passage.

To those who have examined the region of the earlier exploits of Hannibal in Italy it will, I think, seem a pity that Messrs. How and Leigh have departed so largely from the ancient authorities. With regard to the Trebbia both Livy's and Polybius' topography, and consequently much of their history, is rejected. With regard to Trasimene Polybius is practically ignored. This shows a fine independent spirit on the part of the modern historians, but it may seem to some that the method, historically speaking, is open to criticism. Were the question involved in these few pages of this

long history merely one of detail with respect to certain incidents in the Hannibalic campaign, then certainly such criticism as I have attempted would be unduly prolonged, but the matter may be fairly claimed to assume a more serious aspect as disclosing the attitude which the modern authors, in one portion at least of their work, have thought it right to assume with regard to the ancient authorities. The description of the campaign in Italy subsequent to Trasimene is most interesting, and should be read by everybody who cares for that side of history, and the authors are certainly to be congratulated on their adoption of Mr. Strachan-Davidson's views with regard to Cannae.

G. B. GRUNDY.

THE PLACE OF THE *PARMENIDES* IN THE ORDER OF THE PLATONIC DIALOGUES, FURTHER CONSIDERED.

IN his interesting article on 'the place of the *Parmenides* in the order of the Platonic dialogues,' which appeared in the April number of this *Review*, and which seems in some slight measure to take its point of departure from an edition of the *Parmenides* published by me, Professor Campbell is good enough to speak of my work in terms for which I owe him thanks. At the same time the body of his article, which I did not see on its first appearance, implies that his views have received less than justice from myself among others, and that his conclusions differ considerably from mine. Perhaps I may be permitted a word or two on the subject.

(1) I certainly should be very sorry either to say now, or to have said at any time, anything unjust of a scholar to whom Platonic criticism owes so much. Prof. Campbell's arguments from language were advanced in his edition of the *Sophistes* and *Politicus*, and students who failed to consider them attentively as bearing on those dialogues would not be well advised. But he will, I hope, admit that the question is different in regard to other dialogues which he cited only by way of illustration. Thus all that his argument says about the *Parmenides* is as follows (*Soph. and Polit. Introd. p. xxxiii.*):— 'there is no other dialogue which equally with these approximates to the language of the later dialogues [*Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Laws*], as measured by the number of words (in proportion to the number of pages) which

the dialogue in question shares with the *Timaeus*, *Critias*, or *Laws*, and with no other.....The following table exhibits approximately the numerical ratios of the several dialogues according to the number of words at once common and peculiar to each with the *Timaeus*, *Critias*, and *Laws*:—
.....*Parm.*, *Hipp.-Min.* $\frac{1}{2}$The position of the *Parmenides* in this list, like that of the *Phaedrus*, is partly accounted for by exceptional circumstances.' This, it will be seen, is but a passing reference: the words constituting the ratio are not quoted, and the evidence is to some extent discounted by the closing qualification. Before I could deal with the argument in detail I must first have extracted my own evidence from Ast's *Lexicon*, or some other source; a task for which, amid the difficulties under which I worked, I had not time. Prof. Campbell expresses surprise that I should have asked 'by what circumstances?': but at least I hint an answer to my own query in the same sense as he does, by saying 'clearly the subject matter would have to be considered.'

Passing to the general question of linguistic tests as evidence of date, I admit at once that they may have great value; but that value will depend very largely upon 'circumstances.' Let me take examples. I point out in my work that while one German statistician places the *Republic* in a certain position as a result of summing up, in the gross, a series of characteristic

phrases occurring in it, another by the simple expedient of taking the same material in detail, by books, places different books widely apart in Plato's lifetime. I also show, in reference to the *Parmenides*, that while a German statistician classes it as late because of the 'parenthetic' use of *εἰπεῖν* (*εἶπον ἐγώ* etc.) as opposed to the narrative use—*καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπον*—the circumstances of the usage greatly reduce the value of the test. At the opening of the dialogue Plato requires a liberal use of such phrases as 'quoth he,' 'said I.' In eleven pp. of *Steph. ἐφη, φηs, φάναι* occur 58 times parenthetically, and *εἶπον, εἰπεῖν*, in one or other usage, 19 times. And *φάναι* is often suppressed. Clearly a parenthetic *εἰπεῖν*, to break the recurrence of *φάναι*, was a question of euphony, and is no evidence of date. With the general direction of Prof. Campbell's argument, however, I am quite in accord. If you can confidently arrange a group of writings in consecutive order, and then show that a given work has greater and greater linguistic affinities as you travel backward in the list, you establish a *prima facie* case in favour of an early date for the work in question. But I feel some disappointment on seeing the materials—now first published—from which Prof. Campbell's ratio, above referred to, was constructed. Having noted six words as common and peculiar to the *Parmenides*, *Timaeus*, *Critias* and *Laws*, he proceeds to add the *Sophistes*, *Politicus* and *Philebus* to the group and so obtains the following total of twelve words—*ἀπειρία, διαμελεῖν, ἴσον* adv., *ιστίον, μέθεξις, μερίζω, μεριστός, μόνος, παμμεγέθης, παντοδαπός, πολίος, σύνδνο*. Of this list I should be disposed to say that it is too colourless; that, with one exception, it has no item so distinctively and characteristically Platonic as to justify any decided inference. Prof. Campbell himself pronounces judgment upon it when he says 'almost any of these words might have occurred in any Attic writer without surprising the reader.' The one exceptional, symptomatic word is *μέθεξις*, and its effect on my mind is the reverse of that which Prof. Campbell's argument seeks to produce. It suggests a closer connection than I saw before between the *Parmenides* and Prof. Campbell's late group. *Μέθεξις* represents a theory of great importance in Plato's system, and it startles me to learn that the word occurs only in the *Parmenides* and *Sophistes*. Either I had not noted the fact, or else my note had, in the long course of my disjointed labours, got mislaid. All I

can say upon the matter at present is (1) that Prof. Campbell himself describes both dialogues as severely metaphysical, and while the word might thus naturally occur in both, it does not follow that they are closely successive dialogues, as Plato might drop, and subsequently resume, the discussion involving the term: (2) that while this particular word does not occur elsewhere, the analogous *μετάσχεσις* appears in the *Phaedo*, and the verb *μετέχειν* in the *Phaedo* and *Republic*—both words in the technical metaphysical sense: (3) that if, which is not imperative, the use of the term binds the two works together in time, it rather suggests an early date for both. The word *μέθεξις* is the bond which to Aristotle connects Plato with the Pythagoreans—*τὴν δὲ μέθεξιν τοῦτομα μόνον μετέβαλεν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόρειοι μίμησι τὰ ὄντα φασὶν εἶναι τῶν ἀριθμῶν, Πλάτων δὲ μέθεξι, τοῦτομα μεταβαλὼν. Τὴν μέντοι γε μέθεξιν ἢ τὴν μίμησιν, ἥτις ἂν εἴη τῶν εἰδῶν, ἀφείσαν ἐν κοινῷ ζητεῖν* (*Met.* i. 6). While Aristotle says here that the sense of the word was not clearly defined—and as a fact Plato in the *Parmenides* discusses several senses—it seems nevertheless to be a stronger term than either of its equivalents *παρουσία* or *κοινωνία*, and on that ground I feel inclined to reckon it the earliest of the three. And this is in harmony with Prof. Campbell's linguistic arguments for the date of the *Parmenides*.

(2) In our views of the position to be assigned to the *Parmenides* Prof. Campbell and I are—setting this or that type of argument aside—more nearly in accord than readers of his article would perhaps be disposed to fancy. When treating the question, in my edition of the dialogue, I use in regard to the *Parmenides* the words 'a distinctly early position,' 'a very early place'; but I carefully qualify them by the additions 'in the ranks of Plato's metaphysical writings,' 'among Plato's ontological speculations.' I have never considered the position of the *Parmenides* in reference to such works as the *Laches* and *Euthyphro*, or even the *Protagoras*, *Gorgias* and opening books of the *Republic*. It may be, it probably is, later than them all. My concern was to find a place for it among those works which deal with first principles, as a basis on which sounder structures in physics, ethics and politics may be built. Like all students of Plato I accept the *Critias* and *Laws* as very late; and I agree with Prof. Campbell in putting the *Parmenides* before the *Sophistes*, *Politicus*,

Philebus and Timaeus. (It may be well here to recall the fact which is, of course, obvious enough, that the more works you reckon as late the less late you become. If we take bulk and difficulty together, the works thus far placed later than the Parmenides may represent about half Plato's literary activity. He could well write three Euthyphros for one Sophistes.) To go on—Prof. Campbell puts the Parmenides prior to the Theaetetus, but with some hesitation; I agree, without any. To me it seems that, apart from other evidence such as Prof. Campbell adduces, the remark *Παρμενίδης δέ μοι φαίνεται, τὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου, αἰδοῦός τε μοι ἅμα δεινός τε. συμπροσέειξα γὰρ δὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ πάνν νεός πάνν πρεσβύτερ, καὶ μοι ἐφάνη βάθος τι ἔχειν παντάσῃ γενναῖον* (Theaet. 183 E), and the corresponding ones Soph. 217 C, 237 A, 'are references, as clear as Plato's mode of authorship will permit, from those dialogues to the Parmenides as a work already given to the public (my ed. xxxiii.)' It will thus be seen that the question practically resolves itself into this—Where does the Parmenides stand with reference to the Cratylus, Meno, Phaedo, Phaedrus and Republic; Prof. Campbell would place the last two before the Parmenides because they show 'an exulting and triumphant note, a tone of smiling optimism' while the Parmenides betrays a sense of difficulties. This may be admitted; but on the other hand there is a good deal of easy confidence and jocular sense of power in various parts of the Theaetetus, Sophistes and Philebus, and in the whole structure of the Symposium. Now Prof. Campbell puts the Sophistes and Philebus late on other grounds, and scarcely touches the question of the Symposium. Would he group the last with the Phaedrus and Republic because of its exuberant character? It seems to me that as an artistic composition the Symposium is far ahead of the Phaedrus. Then again Prof. Campbell seems inclined to place the Phaedo prior to the Parmenides, which would throw it into connection with the two exultant dialogues. Now I do not say that the Phaedo is a dialogue of despair, but assuredly its hope partakes largely of resignation, and its faith enters into that which is within the veil; and this expressly on the ground of difficulties which cannot be surmounted. Even as regards the Republic I am disposed to place its exultant tone largely in the first half. Nor am I prepared to allow that Plato never was exuberant and optimistic but once. He might lose his optimism in one direction, e.g. in

his power of connecting the ideal sphere with ours, and retain it in another, e.g. in the expansion and unification of the ideal sphere itself. Or, to put it differently, one dialogue, as for instance the Parmenides, may represent the sense of difficulty experienced in reaching the ideal sphere; another, such as the Symposium, shows how exultant he and we should feel on the assumption that we have somehow got there. Prof. Campbell says that my chief reason for placing the Phaedo late 'appears to be that the singular argument in which the inseparable association of Life with Soul is illustrated by the constant conjunction of Heat with Fire, presupposes that communion of kinds, *κοινωνία τῶν γενῶν*, which is elaborately proved in the Sophistes.' I am sorry if my arguments have been obscurely stated, but this does not fairly embody any of them, so far as I can remember. When Prof. Campbell adds that I 'cannot have forgotten that Socrates in the Parmenides is doubtful whether or not to assume an *εἶδος* of *πῆρ*' he fails to observe that the very kernel of much which I advance is precisely this—that many an *εἶδος* is recognized elsewhere which is not admitted in the Parmenides.

My arguments on the position of the Parmenides among the other metaphysical dialogues take, in the main, four forms, and are not in the least mysterious.

1. As Prof. Campbell cites, with some approval, Teichmüller's argument for a change of style from narrative to dramatic, which is supposed to date from the opening of the Theaetetus; so I cite the elaborate discussion of the true discipline for the philosopher, beginning Parm. 135 C, *πρῶτὸ γὰρ, εἰπεῖν* (note the 'parenthetic' *εἰπεῖν*), *πρὶν γυμνασθῆναι, ὃ Σώκρατες, ὀρίζεσθαι ἐπιχειρεῖς καλόν τε τί καὶ δίκαιον καὶ ἀγαθόν καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰδῶν*, as an evidence of a change, not in literary style but, in the more important department of dialectical discussion. Hitherto Plato had discussed the ethical problems specially characteristic of the historic Socrates, and in the somewhat haphazard manner which Socrates had employed. He is now passing from ethics to metaphysics, or first principles, and he finds that something is required in addition to the Socratic method. That something is supplied by the Zenonian or Parmenidean dialectic; and this point is emphasized so strongly that the whole remaining portion of the dialogue is sometimes regarded as nothing more than a dialectical exercise. I assume that Plato is here for the first time

thrown upon his defence after having objectivized the general definitions of Socrates (Arist. *Met.* xii. 4), and is preparing for what proved to be the task of his remaining years—the defence and elaboration of his new theory.

2. I contend that in the *Parmenides*, as compared with the other metaphysical dialogues, the ideal sphere is undeveloped, is simply a mass of Socratic general definitions objectivized. *Parmenides* expressly asks the young Socrates whether, in addition to those objectivized general definitions, he accepts the existence of ideas for 'man fire water' and for 'hair mud filth'—about which the historic Socrates never inquired. In regard to the first group Socrates says he has great difficulties; from the second he recoils with horror. This I regard as showing that Plato had been compelled to face the problem of a great expansion of his ideal sphere, so as to include an *εἶδος ἐνὸς ἐκάστου*: and was preparing to take the step, but as yet hung back. Ideas for such things, and even for manufactured articles, are admitted without hesitation in the *Cratylus*, the latter books of the *Republic*, and the *Phaedo*. Inference—these are later, at least slightly, than the *Parmenides*.

3. And as the ideal sphere is not developed, neither, I hold, is it methodized. (a) The ideas have no order or precedence. At most we can say of τὸ ἐν that Plato is turning this hypothesis of *Parmenides* on all sides to see if he can make a leading idea of it. Now in the latter half of the *Republic* we have the great teleological master idea of τὸ ἀγαθόν, and in the *Sophistes* we have ὄν, στάσις, κίνησις, ταῦτόν, θάτερον, as five pre-eminent ideas which take precedence. (β) In the *Parmenides* relationship between the ideas is treated as being quite unrestricted, any idea can co-relate with any other—τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπορίαν παντοδαπῶς πλεκομένην. Plato does not yet see where relation will lead him. But in the *Sophistes* (251-2 etc.) and also in the *Phaedo* he recognizes that, while there must be relation, it is not indiscriminate but has distinct limits. Thus in the *Phaedo* 'cold' and 'hot' will not relate (perhaps this may explain Prof. Campbell's conception of my argument, referred to above), nor 'even' and 'odd,' οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰ εἶδη τὰ ἐναντία οὔχ ὑπομένει ἐπὶ ὅντα ἄλλα, ἀλλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ. (104).

4. I point out that while in the *Parmenides* all his attempts to bring his ideas to bear upon the world of sense are made subject to the fundamental presupposition that the spheres are totally distinct, he in other works makes various attempts to

bridge over the gulf which separates the spheres. 'This would include all dialogues which discuss or accept the doctrine of ἀνάμνησις—for example the *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, and *Meno*; possibly also those that speak of "divine madness," as the *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*. It would include the simile of the Cave in the *Republic*, and all those attempts to construct a sort of Jacob's ladder, or graded means of descent from the higher sphere to the lower. Such attempts are to be found in the divided line of the *Republic*, the construction of ὑπόθεσις above ὑπόθεσις in the *Phaedo*, and the declaration in the *Philebus* that we must not proceed at once from the one to the unlimited, πρὶν ἂν τις τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτοῦ πάντα κατὰ τὸν μεταξὺ τοῦ ἀείρου τε καὶ τοῦ ἐνός—whatever that description may be held to mean' (my ed. xxx.). The elaboration of these arguments might cost Plato years of labour.

I have no wish to maintain that each argument here advanced is a strong one, although they seem to me as forcible as some of Prof. Campbell's linguistic clues. What I urge is that they hang together, and gain strength thereby. Prof. Campbell, no doubt, objects that 'arguments of this kind (turning on Plato's manner of stating a view) have really not much force' and prefers tests drawn from vocabulary. Now in the case which he cites as analogous—that of painting—it may be conceded for argument's sake that an expert would deal principally with brush work and other technique, and avoid the risk of seeking to trace changes in the painter's mental attitude towards his subjects. But is not the case reversed when from painting we pass to the works of a speculative thinker? For what does Prof. Campbell, like others, seek to determine the order of Plato's writings at all, except to make sure of the successive stages in his manner of stating his view?

There are, of course, other means of arriving at a conclusion, which affect separate dialogues; I will confine myself to an illustration for the *Phaedo*. The passage to which I appeal for two connected arguments is pp. 100 B—101.

(a) In the *Parmenides* the young Socrates—representing the young Plato—is described as throwing out his first adumbration of a doctrine of ideas—τόδε μοι εἰπέ· οὐ νομίζεις εἶναι αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ εἶδος τι δμοιότητος; etc. (129). *Parmenides* is represented as being struck with the novelty and originality of the suggestion, and asks (130 B) καὶ μοι εἰπέ, αὐτὸς σὺ οὕτω διήρησαι ὡς λέγεις, χωρὶς μὲν εἶδη αὐτὰ ἄττα, χωρὶς δὲ τὰ τούτων αὐτὸ μετέχοντα; In the

Phaedo the old Socrates just before his death—corresponding to the aged Plato—is introduced speaking thus (100 B): ἀλλ', ἢ δ' ὅς, ὃδε λέγω, οὐδὲν καινόν (would the reader note that?), ἀλλ' ἄπερ αἰεὶ (and that?), καὶ ἄλλοτε (and that?), καὶ ἐν τῷ παρεληλυθότι λόγῳ, οὐδὲν πέπαιμαι λέγων (and that?). ἔρχομαι γὰρ δὴ ἐπιχειρῶν σοι ἐπιδείξασθαι τῆς αἰτίας τὸ εἶδος ὃ πεπραγμάτευμαι, καὶ εἰμι πάλιν (and that?), ἐπ' ἐκείνα τὰ πολυβρύλητα (and that?), καὶ ἄρχομαι ἀπ' ἐκείνων ὑποθέμενος εἶναι τι καλὸν αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ μέγα καὶ ἅλλα πάντα. If this contrast does not speak for itself, it seems to me useless to speculate what Plato may mean in any other connection.

(b) Plato in the *Parmenides*, while quite alive to the difficulties of *μέθεξις*, yet spends much time and ingenuity in arguing for and against it in several senses. In the *Phaedo* we have what clearly seems to be his farewell to argument upon the question, and his announcement that his faith remains unshaken despite the fact that his arguments have been shattered. The oftener I read the passage the more satisfied I am of its valedictory character, as the review of a life's effort; and I find myself wholly out of sympathy with Prof. Campbell's remarks on it—'the different modes of *μέθεξις* (or *μετάσχεσις*) are treated loosely and vaguely'—with the view of bringing out that the *Parmenides* is the later work. The passage follows on the last and is too long to quote; but I would ask readers, bearing in mind what has just been said above, to turn to it and read it carefully, more particularly the words τὰ μὲν ἅλλα χαίρειν εἶω, παράττομαι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι, τοῦτο δὲ ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀτέχνως καὶ ἴσως εὐήθως ἔχω παρ' ἐμᾶντῳ, ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλο τι ποιεῖ αὐτὸ καλὸν ἢ ἡ ἐκείνου τοῦ καλοῦ εἴτε παρουσία εἴτε κοινωνία εἴτε ὅπῃ δὴ καὶ ὅπως προσγενομένη (call it what you like, I no longer dispute on the point)· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι τοῦτο δισχυρίζομαι (can there be any mistake about that?)—ἀλλ' ὅτι τῷ καλῷ πάντα τὰ καλὰ γίνεται καλὰ. He is starting on his long journey, and he makes that confession of faith 'believing where he cannot prove'; nay, as regards proof *δεδίδως τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σκιάν*. If he has any argument now it is that death alone will solve the mystery, and take him to the τόπος νοητός of which here he has at best an *ἀνάμνησις*. If this argument stood alone it might possibly be urged against it that Plato is simply, as a stroke of art, representing the dying Socrates in character. But that could not be urged in the case of argument (a), and the two are obviously parts of one picture. To my

mind it is certain that the *Phaedo* is a late work.

On the question of the place to be assigned to the *Parmenides* I am, of course, aware that my conclusions do not, and I should suppose that Prof. Campbell's would not, commend themselves to the eminently qualified and most considerate reviewer of my work in these columns, Mr. R. D. Hicks. It would be out of place for me to enter into an argument with him. I will only say on the one hand that I am not satisfied that the objections which he raises are fatal to the view that the *Parmenides* ranks early, and on the other that no one can enter on the question of Platonic chronology without realizing very soon 'that each has a story in a dispute and a true one too, and both are right or wrong as you will.' I should almost be tempted to offer a general grouping of the metaphysical dialogues, were I not conscious that at best its worth must be small. For one thing, our evidence is too largely circumstantial; and whatever line of inference may be pursued, we are sure to find that somewhere it betrays us. Thus Prof. Campbell and I agree that the *Philebus* is later than the *Parmenides*. But how much later? Reasoning, as I have done, from (1) *μέθεξις* and (2) the contents of the ideal sphere, I find my arguments pulling different ways. The hopefulness shown in the *Philebus* (14-17) on the former point, and the ridicule poured on the antinomies that arise from an abstract opposition of the two spheres, suggest a wide interval. On the other hand, some hesitation is betrayed regarding the ideas themselves—*περὶ τούτων τῶν ἐνάδων ἡ πολλὴ ἀμφισβήτησις γίνεται*—which reduces the gap. Again, in drawing up lists we incline to assume that the works are strictly successive. They need not be. I could, for instance, imagine the *Republic* being dropped and then resumed, and the *Parmenides* being written during the pause. Finally the argument that because of resemblance in matter such works as the *Parmenides*, *Sophistes*, and *Politicos* are closely linked in time, fails to carry conviction. Plato—to continue our assumption—would hear criticisms upon the *Parmenides* only after its publication, and might naturally finish the *Republic*, with any other work already outlined, before resuming that branch of inquiry. One of the clearest indications of sequence, and even of close sequence, supplied by Plato himself is the passage in which the *Timaeus* seems to be affiliated to the *Republic*, yet nobody alleges that nothing came between.

W. W. WADDELL.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

II. THE SYMPOSIUM.

MEHLER's edition (Leyden 1850) is a work of excellent scholarship, to which Sauppe and Dindorf have not paid enough attention. The remarks of Cobet, to which I refer occasionally, are in the *Novae Lectiones*. I have had no opportunity of consulting Schenkl's remarks on the *Symposium* in the third part of his *Xenophontische Studien*.

1, 7. οἱ οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Σωκράτην πρῶτον μὲν ὥσπερ εἰκὸς ἦν ἐπαινοῦντες τὴν κλῆσιν οὐχ ὑπισχυρόντο συνδειπνήσειν· ὥς δὲ πάντῳ ἀχθόμενος φανερός ἦν, εἰ μὴ ἔψοιντο, συνηκολούθησαν. ἔπειτα δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ μὲν γυμνασάμενοι καὶ χρυσάμενοι, οἱ δὲ καὶ λουσάμενοι παρήλθον.

Who are the subject of παρήλθον? Not Socrates and his companions; for they accompanied Callias at once and had no time to prepare themselves. But, if other guests are meant, as seems clear, Xenophon must have specified them by some such words as ἔπειτα δὲ αὐτῷ <καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι> οἱ μὲν κ.τ.λ., for without this addition the subject of παρήλθον must be the subject of συνηκολούθησαν. Xenophon himself is to be understood as being one of these unnamed guests, for the words in § 1, οἷς δὲ παραγεγόμενος ταῦτα γιγνώσκω δηλῶσαι βούλομαι, admit of no other interpretation than that he was actually present at this particular symposium. Whether he was, or whether the symposium ever took place, is another question.

Mehler questions the use of παρήλθον and proposes παρήσαν. The use is certainly doubtful and παρήσαν would be idiomatic, but I should prefer προσήλθον as nearer the MSS. Παρά and πρὸς are known to be sometimes confused. So perhaps in 4, 45 παρ' αὐτοῦ should be changed with Mehler to πρὸς αὐτόν.

1, 10. τὰ τε ὄμματα φιλοφρονεστέρως ἔχουσι καὶ τὴν φωνὴν πρῶτεράν ποιοῦνται καὶ τὰ σχήματα εἰς τὸ ἐλευθεριώτατον ἄγουσιν.

Read ἐλευθεριώτερον. There is no reason for the superlative, when the other words are in the comparative. Mehler's ποίεσθαι for ποιοῦνται had occurred to me independently and I believe it to be right. So in Herod. 1, 89 Bekker's προήσουσι for ποιήσουσι seems right (cf. χρήματα μὲν σφί προείντα *ib.* 1, 24).

1, 11. The word κατάγεσθαι seems strangely used, when the professional jester knocks at the door and bids the servant say ὅστις τε

εἶη καὶ διότι κατάγεσθαι βούλοιο. Κατάγεσθαι is not used of a guest at an entertainment but of a stranger visiting a place and putting up at a particular house. In this sense it is used properly in 8, 39. Even if it were suitable here, some further specification like ἐνταῦθα or παρὰ τῷ Καλλίᾳ would have to be added. Is it a mistake for κατακείσθαι which occurs in § 14? Καλεῖσθαι 'to be asked in, invited' (as in Plat. *Symp.* 212 D and 213 A) or κατακλίνεσθαι is less probable.

Callias, remarking that it would be mean to grudge him shelter and giving orders for his admission, ἄμα ἀπέβλεψεν εἰς τὸν Αὐτόλκον, δῆλον ὅτι ἐπισκοπῶν τί ἐκείνῳ δόξει τὸ σκῶμμα εἶναι. The last words ought in ordinary Greek to mean 'what he thought the joke consisted in,' and certainly the commentators have found it hard enough to say in what it did consist. If however the words are genuine, perhaps Xenophon wrote ἐπισκοπῶν <ποῖον> τι, 'what he thought of the joke,' and ποῖον fell out after the last letters of ἐπισκοπῶν. Mehler would bracket δῆλον ὅτι...εἶναι, as an adscript introduced by the δῆλον ὅτι common in such cases.

1, 14. ἐν τῷ μεταξύ seems unmeaning.

1, 15. ἥπερ for ἥ is not an Attic word, nor does it seem to occur elsewhere in Xenophon. Probably we should read ἥ.

2, 3. τί οὖν εἰ καὶ μύρον τις ἡμῖν ἐνέγκαι, ἵνα καὶ εὐωδία ἐστιώμεθα; Read probably ἐστιώμεθα.

2, 4. Οὐκοῦν νέοις μὲν ἂν εἶη ταῦτα· ἡμᾶς δὲ...τίνας ὄζειν δεήσει; something like πρέποντα seems needed with νέοις.

Ibid. ὁ μὲν Θεόγνις ἔφη 'ἰσθλῶν κ.τ.λ.'

Read ὁ μὲν Θεόγνις, ἔφη, <λέγει> 'ἰσθλῶν κ.τ.λ.' Ἐφῆ could hardly be used to introduce the quotation, and the context shows that we want it in the more common use. Two other answers of Socrates are just before accompanied by ἔφη.

2, 6. ἐνταῦθα δὴ πολλοὶ ἐφθέγγαντο.

Πολλοὶ <πολλὰ> Mehler. Perhaps ἄμα should be inserted. (In 7, 1, ἐπειδὴ πάντες ἐπιθυμοῦμεν λέγειν, νῦν ἂν μάλιστα καὶ ἄμα ἄσσοιμεν, Mehler inserts ἄμα before λέγειν.)

2, 8. παρεστῆκώς δέ τις τῇ ὀρχηστρίδι ἀνεδίδον τοὺς τροχοὺς μέχρι δώδεκα.

What is the force of ἀνά in ἀνεδίδον? There seems no reason to think the girl was on any kind of platform, for ἐφεστηκῆναι just before means only 'standing close by,' i.e. she was in the room, not outside, waiting to

begin. Cf. *στὰς ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνδρῶνι* in 1, 13. In 9, 2, *θρόνος τις ἔνδον κατετέθη*, there is no suggestion of a raised platform. Perhaps we should read *ἐνεδίδου*, 'put into her hand.' In 5, 9 *ἀνέφερον* has been corrected to *διέφερον*, but *διεδίδου* here would imply (I think) more than one recipient.

2, 9. *ἡ γυναικεία φύσις οὐδὲν χείρων τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὕσα τυγχάνει, γνώμης δὲ καὶ ἰσχύος δέεται* (προσδέεται Cobet).

The emendation *ρώμης* for *γνώμης* should be accepted. If women are inferior in intellect as well as in bodily strength, how can they be called *οὐδὲν χείρους*? There is not much else to be inferior in, for Socrates is not thinking of character.

2, 13. Should not *ἀρ' οὐν* be *ἀρ' οὐ*?

2, 20. *εἰ τοῖς ἀγορανόμοις ἀφιστάτης* (*ἀφισταίης* Mehler and Cobet) *ὥσπερ ἄρτους τὰ κάτω πρὸς τὰ ἄνω*.

Ἀφισταίης ('weigh out') seems unmeaning in this connexion. As *ἀπό* and *πρός* sometimes get confused in MSS., perhaps we should read *προσισταίης* ('weigh against').

2, 25. *δοκεῖ μέντοι μοι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν συμπόσια ταῦτ' ἀσχεῖν ἄπερ καὶ τὰ ἐν γῇ φύμενα*.

Athenaeus has *σώματα* for *συμπόσια*, and many scholars (Cobet included) have adopted it. But we may notice (1) that in working out the comparison Socrates speaks of the mind as well as the body (*καὶ τὰ σώματα καὶ αἱ γνῶμαι σφαλοῦνται*): (2) that *ἦν δὲ ἡμῖν οἱ παῖδες μικραῖς κύλιξι πυκνὰ ἐπιπακάζωσιν* suggests a symposium: (3) that Athenaeus or a copyist might well substitute *σώματα* by inadvertence, whereas *συμπόσια* is very unlikely to have been so substituted.

2, 26. *οὕτως οὐ βιαζόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ οἴνου μεθύειν ἄλλ' ἀναπειθόμενοι πρὸς τὸ παιγνιωδέστερον ἀφιξόμεθα*.

Μεθύειν is clearly wrong as it stands, for Socrates does not propose to get drunk either by the gentle persuasion of small cups or by the rapid compulsion of large ones. Yet Cobet seems wrong in wishing to omit the word altogether. Schneider suggests that a verb in the future, which governed it and answered to *ἀφιξόμεθα*, has been omitted. Why not read *<πρὸς τὸ> μεθύειν*? Cf. 4, 37 *ἄχρι τοῦ μὴ πεινῆν ἀφικέσθαι*. The *ὑπὸ τοῦ* might cause the omission of the *πρὸς* τό.

3, 1. The old emendation of *εὐφροσύνην* (a favourite Xenophontean word and often contrasted with *λύπη*) for *ἀφροδίτην*, which is both unseemly and unsuitable, seems to me certain. In 2, 24, to which Charmides is referring, *φιλοφροσύνη* is the word used, unless it is a mistake for *εὐφροσύνη*. Liddell

and Scott give no other example of *φιλοφροσύνη* in this sense.

3, 8. *Αὐτολύκῳ τοῦτ' ἰκανή*. Read *τουτ' ἰ* in accordance with Cobet's note on 4, 37. He seems to have overlooked this passage. One would easily fall out before another.

3, 9. It will also be in accordance with a rule of Cobet's (*N.L.* p. 420) to read *ἐπ' εὐχαρίτι* γὰρ *πράγματι* for *ἐπ' εὐχαρίστῳ*. *Εὐχαρίστος* means 'grateful.'

4, 23. *Ἄλλ' ἐγώ, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐδὲ πρὸς σοῦ ποιῶ τὸ περιδεῖν Κριτόβουλον οὕτως ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος ἐκπλαγέντα*.

Ποιῶ can hardly be right for 'I consider,' nor is Mehler's *ποιούμαι* very plausible. *Ποιέσθαι* τι μέγα, *οὐκ ἀνάσχετον, συμφοράν*, etc., all mean more than pure thinking. They have a notion of 'treating' a thing as so and so, making it so and so. Neither *ποιεῖν* nor *ποιέσθαι* is a mere synonym for *νομίζω*. It is not easy however to find the real word, unless it was *δοκῶ*, which occurs in the very next sentence in the same personal use (*δοκεῖς γάρ...οὕτω διατεθῆναι αὐτόν*), perhaps as an echo of this.

4, 37. *ὅμοια γάρ μοι δοκοῦσι πάσχειν ὥσπερ εἴ τις πολλὰ ἔχων καὶ πολλὰ ἐσθίων μηδέποτε ἐμπίμπλατο*. *ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτω μὲν πολλὰ ἔχω ὥς μόλις αὐτὰ καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς εὐρίσκω*. *ὅμως δὲ περίεστί μοι κ.τ.λ.*

Πολλὰ ἔχων has been much questioned and *πολλὰ πίνων*, or the omission of the words, proposed. I concur in thinking them wrong, but *οὕτω μὲν πολλὰ ἔχω* seems to me still more so. Antisthenes is contrasting his own scanty resources, which yet satisfy him, with the affluence of rich men who are never satisfied. There would be no point in making him use the word *πολλά* ironically, but, taken literally, it gives exactly the wrong meaning. I think *ὀλίγα*, or some similar word, must have been accidentally changed to *πολλά* from the occurrence of *πολλά* close by. On this cause of corruption compare what is said by Blass in the preface to his text of Isocrates, '*Peccant optimi codices vel maxime eo, quod oculo librarii ad proxima aberrante vel male addunt quaedam vel ad aliorum similitudinem corrumpunt*,' and the instructive examples he gives from the *Urbina*s as well as from inferior MSS. See also Vahlen on Aristotle's *Poetics* 1460b 15.

4, 38. *ἔργον μέ γ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνεγείραι*.

The enclitic *με* before *γε* is surely a solecism, though both Dindorf and Sauppe give it. Read either *ἔργον μ' ἐστὶ* with Heindorf or *ἔργον γέ μ' ἐστὶ*.

4, 49. Hermogenes combines devoutness towards the gods with economy: *ἐπαινῶ τε*

γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὐδὲν δαπανῶν, ὡν τε διδῶσιν αἰεὶ αὐτῷ παρέχουμαι, εὐφημῶ τε ὅσα ἂν δύνωμαι κ.τ.λ. Mehler inserts τι before παρέχουμαι; but the meaning would be inadequately expressed and, whether H. gave something to the gods in sacrifice or to men in charity and kindness, it would hardly be consistent with οὐδὲν δαπανῶν. The point of the passage evidently is that his devoutness costs him nothing at all. Perhaps Xenophon wrote something like < χάριν > or < εὐχαριστίαν > παρέχουμαι.

4, 63. ὥστε διὰ τοὺς σοὺς λόγους ἐρῶντες ἐκινδρομοῦμεν ἀλλήλους ζητοῦντες.

Mehler omits ἐρῶντες. It might be better to omit ζητοῦντες, which seems a gloss on ἐκινδρομοῦμεν and is very weak when added to it.

5, 6. εἴπερ γε τοῦ ὁσφραίνεσθαι ἔνεκεν ἐποίησαν ἡμῖν ῥίνας οἱ θεοί.

Not ἐποίησαν but ἐνεποίησαν is the word required. Cf. *Mem.* 1, 4, 11 ὅψιν καὶ ἀκοῇν καὶ στόμα ἐνεποίησαν: ἰδ. 6 γλῶττα... ἐνεργάσθη: ἰδ. 5 ῥίνας προσετίθησαν. The *en* has been lost after the last letters of ἔνεκεν.

5, 10. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐξέπεσον αἱ ψῆφοι καὶ ἐγένοντο πᾶσαι σὺν Κριτοβούλῳ.

Πᾶσαι must be used humorously, for it is clear that the boy and girl, not the guests, are the judges. Cf. 4, 18-20 and the banter about kisses here (5, 9: 6, 1). 'Ανέφερον in 9 is probably to be altered with Cobet to διέφερον.

6, 9. 'Αλλ' εἴπερ γέ τοι τοῖς πᾶσι καλοῖς καὶ τοῖς βελτίστοις εἰκάσω αὐτὸν, ἔπαινοντι μᾶλλον ἢ λουδορομένῳ δικαίως ἂν εἰκάζοι μέ τις. Καὶ νῦν σὺ γε λουδορομένῳ ἔοικας, εἰ πάντ' αὐτοῦ βελτίῳ φῆς εἶναι. 'Αλλὰ βούλει πονηροτέρους εἰκάσω αὐτόν; Μηδὲ πονηροτέρους.

The first sentence here has given considerable trouble, and perhaps we cannot hope to get it exactly right. Βελτίῳ in Antisthenes' rejoinder and the πονηροτέρους following seem to show that βελτίστοις must be a mistake for βελτίοισιν. If we substitute this and leave out the articles, we shall get what must have been the sense of the passage, εἴπερ γέ τοι πᾶσι καλοῖς καὶ βελτίοισιν εἰκάσω αὐτόν, 'if all my comparisons are flattering.' It is hard to account for the intrusion of the articles, but the sense seems peremptorily to require their omission, that the adjectives may have a predicative force. Jacobs may have been right in suggesting τούτοις, referring to the ἄλλα πολλά before mentioned, in place of τοι τοῖς; but this would still leave the second τοῖς unexplained. Εἰκάσω should perhaps be εἰκάσω, as the εἰκασία apparently consists in words not yet uttered rather than in a fancy already conceived.

7, 4. ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὐκ εἰς ταῦτον τῷ οἴνῳ ἐπισπένδει· εἰ δὲ ὀρχοῦντο πρὸς τὸν αὐλὸν σχήματα ἐν οἷς Χάριτες τε καὶ Ὀραι καὶ Νύμφαι γράφονται, κ.τ.λ.

It does not seem possible that both καὶ and μὲν should stand with ταῦτα. Omit καὶ. On the other hand with σχήματα we seem to want some qualifying word such as τοιαῦτα or τινα, perhaps σχήματ' < ἅττα >. ἅττα is not, I think, common in Xenophon, but cf. *Hipparch.* 8, 7 ἅλλ' ἅττα. Or should we read ἐν οἷς for ἐν οἷς?

8, 1. 'Αρ', ἔφη, ὦ ἄνδρες, εἰκὸς ἡμᾶς παρόντος δαίμονος μεγάλου... μὴ ἀμνημονῆσαι;

Μὴ ἀμνημονῆσαι gives us the contrary meaning to that required, and this has been remedied by omitting μὴ. Perhaps we ought to read < οὐκ > εἰκός. Any awkwardness in the two negatives is removed by the distance between them. οὐκ might fall out from its likeness to the first letters of εἰκός.

8, 5. ὡς σαφῶς μέντοι σὺ, μαστροπὲ σαντοῦ, αἰεὶ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖς· τότε μὲν τὸ δαιμόνιον προφασιζόμενος οὐ διαλέγει μοι, τότε δ' ἄλλου τὸν ἐφίμενος.

I do not see any occasion to follow Cobet in omitting οὐ διαλέγει μοι, which he takes to be an adscript on τοιαῦτα ποιεῖς: rather it seems to me an almost necessary addition to make Antisthenes' meaning clear. But is not τοιαῦτα an error for ταῦτά, which is the expression more wanted here? ταῦτό and ταῦτά have got corrupted several times in the text of the *Symposium* and have been restored by scholars. Thus 4, 56 τοῦτο stands for ταῦτό: 8, 15 ταῦτα for ταῦτά. In 2, 22 ὅτι δ' ἡ παῖς εἰς τοῦπισθεν καμπτομένη τροχοῦς ἐμμεῖτο, ἐκείνος ταῦτα εἰς τὸ ἐμπροσθεν ἐπικύπτων μμείσθαι τροχοῦς ἐπειράτο, I would read ταῦτά and omit μμείσθαι τροχοῦς. In 9, 7 ὅπως τούτων τύχοιεν, words which Mehler would omit altogether, I would in any case read τῶν αὐτῶν.

8, 13. ὅτι μὲν γὰρ δὴ ἄνευ φιλίας συνουσία οὐδεμία ἀξιόλογος, πάντες ἐπιστάμεθα· φιλεῖν γε μὴν τῶν μὲν τὸ ἦθος ἀγαμένων ἀνάγκη ἡδεῖα καὶ ἐθελουσία καλεῖται· τῶν δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμούντων πολλοὶ μὲν τοὺς τρόπους μέμφονται καὶ μισοῦσι τῶν ἐρωμένων κ.τ.λ.

Valckenaer and Cobet restore φιλία for φιλεῖν, no doubt rightly, but the sense of the sentence seems unsatisfactory. If one person is attracted to another by admiration of his character, by whom is this called a pleasant voluntary compulsion? Surely it cannot be meant that this is the way in which other people, the world in general, describe it. Rather it is the way in which the man himself, who yields with pleasure to the attraction and lets himself go, would

speak of it. So he is distinguished from the men next mentioned, who hate the very person that attracts them (the constantly misunderstood *odi et amo* of Catullus) and would speak of the force that draws them as the very opposite of ἡδεῖα and ἐβελονσία. These feelings and these expressions belong to οἱ ἐρώντες themselves, not to indifferent spectators. Read therefore *φιλία γε μὴν* < ὑπὸ > or < πρὸς > τῶν μὲν τὸ ἦθος ἀγαμένων ... καλεῖται. There is no need for ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν : cf. 2, 2 ἡ αὐλητρίς μὲν... ὃ δὲ παῖς : *ib.* 17 τὰ σκέλη μὲν... τοὺς ὤμους δέ.

8, 16. Mehler's *θάλλοντα* for *θάλλουσα*, an emendation which had occurred to me before I was able to consult his edition of the dialogue, seems to me clearly right and removes all difficulty, though Sauppe in his *Appendicula* of critical notes does not even mention it.

8, 17. *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις πιστεύοι μὴτ' ἂν παρά τι ποιήσῃ μὴτ' ἂν καμὼν ἀμορφότερος γένηται μειωθῆναι ἂν τὴν φιλίαν.*

For *παρά τι ποιήσῃ*, which has no meaning, *παρὰ μᾶλλον* or *παρηβύσῃ* has been proposed; but what in the course of nature is certain to come ought not to be put as a merely possible contingency side by side with the loss of good looks through illness. In the passage that follows, describing a constant affection, we have the reference to illness repeated (*ἦν δὲ κάμῃ ὑπότερος οὖν, πολὺ συνεχεστέραν τὴν συνουσίαν ἔχειν*), but nothing about the time when a man is no longer young. We have however another possible contingency mentioned there, which sometimes tries affection and fidelity, *συνάχθῃσθαι δὲ ἦν τι σφάλμα προσπίπτῃ*, and it seems not

unreasonable to think that something may have been said here too about possible misfortunes. The slightest change to give that meaning would be *ἂν παρά τι ποινήσῃ*, 'if for any reason he is in trouble,' and *πονεῖν* is certainly confused with *ποιεῖν* elsewhere. But the expression is perhaps not a very probable one and some more considerable change may be preferable. Or again Xenophon may have written something like *παρὰ < τοὺς νόμους > τι ποιήσῃ*.

8, 35. *καὶ μετὰ ξένων κἂν μὴ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει* (τάξει Dobree, Cobet) *ταχῶσι τῷ ἑραστῇ*. Read *κἂν μετὰ ξένων καὶ μὴ*. Perhaps *πόλει* is an injudicious adscript. Cf. *τῆς πρώτης τεταγμένος* Lys. 16, 15.

8, 40. *ὥς μὲν οὖν σοι ἡ πόλις τάχῃ ἂν ἐπιτρέψειεν αὐτήν, εἰ βούλει, εὖ ἴσθι.*

Should not *βούλει* be *βούλοιο*? In *Oecon.* 8, 10 I have suggested the change of *βούλοιο* and *δέοιο* to *βούλει* and *δέει*.

Ibid. *ἱερὸς θεῶν τῶν ἀπ' Ἑρεχθέως, οἳ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βάρβαρον σὺν Ἰάκῳ ἐστράτευσαν.*

As Demeter and Persephone are meant, *οἳ* should be *αἱ*.

9, 5. *ὀρώντες ὄντως καλὸν μὲν τὸν Διόνυσον, ὡραῖαν δὲ τὴν Ἀριάδην, οὗ σκώπτουτας δὲ ἄλλ' ἀληθινῶς τοῖς στόμασι φιλοῦντας.*

Σκώπτουτας in the sense of 'pretending,' 'playing at' kissing is certainly impossible, as *σκώπτειν* always implies something in the way of wit or humour. Mehler however shows less than his usual insight in suggesting *σκηπτομένους*, since *σκήπτομαι* connotes an excuse or pretext, and is not co-extensive with 'pretending.' I suggest *ἀπατώντας* or *ἐξαπατώντας*.

H. RICHARDS.

NOTE ON εἰ σωφρονοῦσι IN THUCYDIDES, I. 40.

εἰ γὰρ εἴρηται ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς ἐξεῖναι παρ' ὑπότερους τις τῶν ἀγράφων πόλεων βούλεται ἐλθεῖν, οὐ τοῖς ἐπὶ βλάβῃ ἐτέρων ἰούσιν ἢ ξυνηθήκη ἐστίν, ἀλλ'... ὅστις μὴ τοῖς δεξαμένοις εἰ σωφρονοῦσι πόλεμον ἀντ' εἰρήνης ποιήσει.

In his recent edition Mr. Forbes has argued strongly for the view that the difficult words *εἰ σωφρονοῦσι* refer, not to the conduct of a state in accepting or declining a proffered alliance which conforms to the conditions laid down, but to the subsequent conduct of the state which has accepted such an alliance. Notwithstanding the persuasiveness of Mr. Forbes I think that the other view (preferred in the notes, in Jowett's

translation) which regards the words in question as an afterthought, introduced at the expense of an anomaly in the syntax, is nearer the truth; for it seems to be strongly supported by a passage in Herodotus which I am rather surprised to find is not cited in the commentaries. Themistocles, advocating that the Greeks should remain at Salamis, urges the argument (viii. 60):

ὁμοίως αὐτοῦ τε μένων προναυμαχίσεις Πελοποννήσου καὶ πρὸς τῷ Ἰσθμῷ, οὐδέ σφεας, εἰ περ εὖ φρονέεις, ἄξεις ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον. The anomaly arises from the attempt to express two conditional sentences as one, namely: (a) *εἰ αὐτοῦ μένεις οὐ σφεας ἄξεις ἐπὶ*

τὴν Πελοπόννησον, and (b) εἰ εὖ φρονέεις, οὐκ ἐβελήσεις σφεις ἄγειν ἐπὶ τὴν Π. In Thucydides we have not only an anomaly of just the same kind, but an almost identical phrase. The two ideas which properly demand two sentences and are compressed into one are : (a) if the treaty is observed, an ἀγραφος

πόλις seeking an alliance with one of the signatories will be required to conform to certain conditions ; (b) the signatories, εἰ σωφρονοῦσι, will receive ἀγραφοί πόλεις only under those conditions.

J. B. BURY.

ON THE MEANING OF CERTAIN PASSAGES IN THUCYDIDES VI.

IN the following notes a new explanation is offered of certain passages in the Sixth Book of Thucydides that are regarded by all editors and critics as either obscure or corrupt. The contention that I make is that in order to find the meaning of a passage, we must first construe it literally, then see what explanation arises out of the construe. If that explanation is in agreement with the context, then we may accept the text as sound. In all the passages construed, I find that the explanation satisfies this requirement. What therefore the reader has to judge of is mainly the accuracy of the bald construe appended to each passage. If he admits my construe, he will, I think, accept my explanation. Of course every one of these passages has been discussed at length by many critics abler than myself. But, instead of going over the ground again, I have preferred to go back to first principles. Of some critics, Junghahn, for example, and Müller-Strübing, I should say that the very length of their discussions has sometimes tended to intensify rather than to dispel the darkness.

For the purpose of readily contrasting the construe proposed with some view that has found powerful support, I have in most cases appended Jowett's translation.

* C. 14, 1 καὶ σύ, ὦ πρύτανι, ἐπιβλήσεις, νομίσας, εἰ ὀρθωθεὶς τὸ ἀναψηφίσαι, τὸ μὲν λύνει τοὺς νόμους μὴ μετὰ τοσούτῳ ἂν μαρτύρων αἰτίαν σχεῖν.

Construe : 'Thinking, if you are afraid of [the illegal act of] putting a question again to the vote, that illegal action would not be blamed where there are so many witnesses [to its innocence].'

It is generally agreed from this passage that it was illegal to reopen a discussion on a vote. Nicias here distinctly implies that the act would be παράνομον, but that the ἄδεια or permission would of course be readily granted in such a case. Hence Nicias is really proposing a vote of ἄδεια on

the ground that ἡ σωτηρία τῆς πόλεως required it. τὸ λύνει τοὺς νόμους αἰτίαν ἔχει = 'law-breaking is blamed.' ['If you hesitate, remember that . . . there can be no question of breaking the law,' J.]

* C. 21, 2 μηνῶν οὐδὲ τεσσάρων τῶν χειμερινῶν ἀγγελον ῥάδιον ἐλθεῖν.

'Not even within four months, namely the winter months, is it easy for a messenger to come.'

For the use of the gen. cf. v. 14 οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι φόντο ὀλίγων ἐτῶν καθαιρήσειν τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων δύναμιν. Nicias puts the distance between Sicily and Athens in the worst light by saying that in winter it may be that more than four months may elapse before the messenger can start, or, if he starts, can reach Athens. In the latter case he may have to put in for shelter at some port on the way and wait for spring. Thus οὐδέ is not, as the editors suppose, misplaced, nor is τῶν χειμερινῶν spurious. ['During the four winter months hardly even a message can be sent hither,' J.]

In * c. 23, 1 ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐλθωμεν ἐνθένδε μὴ ἀντίπαλον μόνον παρασκευασάμενοι, πλήν γε πρὸς τὸ μάχιμον αὐτῶν τὸ ὀπλιτικόν κ.τ.λ., some propose to alter or to remove τὸ ὀπλιτικόν. If Nicias is made to say that it is necessary to attack the Syracusans 'with a force a match for theirs, except, of course, as regards our hoplites in comparison with their (total) fighting force,' the sentence is really nonsense. It would be absurd to suggest that Athens might be thought not to be a match for Syracuse because the Athenian infantry could not equal the whole of the Syracusan forces added together. No evidence of disparity could be deduced from such a consideration. The fact is that τὸ ὀπλιτικόν is object to παρασκευασάμενοι, and that a comma is required after αὐτῶν. The Athenians were strong in infantry, they were weak in cavalry : they could easily send a force of infantry equal to any force of infantry that Syracuse could put

into the field. But, says Nicias, though the *heavy infantry* be a match for them (except of course, he throws in, when compared with their infantry and cavalry taken together), that will not be enough. What is required is that all the forces taken from Athens should be more than a match for the enemy's whole fighting force, so as to counter-balance the obvious inferiority in cavalry. The unusual position of τὸ ὀπλιτικόν is accounted for by the prominence that has already been given to the 'hoplites' in the previous chapter. It is emphatic, and requires to be made so in the sentence.

* C. 31, 1 παρασκευὴ γὰρ αὕτη πρώτη ἐκπλεύσασα μῆς πόλεως δυνάμει Ἑλληνικῇ πολυτελεστάτῃ δὴ καὶ εὐπρεπεστάτῃ τῶν ἐς ἐκείνους τὸν χρόνον ἐγένετο.

The sentence might have run παρασκευὴ γὰρ αὕτη πρώτη (ἢ ἢ) ἐκπλεύσασα μῆς πόλεως δυνάμει Ἑλληνικῇ π. . . ἐγένετο. 'This was the first expedition that having sailed from a single city with a Greek force far surpassed all those that had hitherto (sailed from a single city with a Greek force) in costliness and magnificence.' Thucydides here looks forward to a time when possibly some Greek state might send out an expedition that would beat the record established by the Sicilian Expedition for costliness and magnificence. In this passage πρώτη would be illogical—the note in Jowett says it is so—were it not that πολυτελεστάτῃ δὴ καὶ εὐπρεπεστάτῃ τῶν ἐς ἐκείνους τὸν χρόνον clearly means something more than πολυτελεστέραν καὶ εὐπρεπεστέραν τῶν ἐς ἐκείνους τὸν χρόνον. The superlative with δὴ implies a *great stride* forwards. Some expedition in the past may have been second to it, but it was *longo proximo intervallo*. Some earlier expedition from a Greek city—say the next after the Argonauts—must have established some sort of record, but it was only a little better than that which went before. Of course μῆς πόλεως δυνάμει Ἑλληνικῇ excludes such expeditions as those of the Persians.

Recent editors who retain the text place a comma before πρώτη and after Ἑλληνικῇ, and render 'being the first to sail from a single city with a Greek force'; but this is contrary to fact, unless δυνάμει Ἑλληνικῇ can, as Stahl supposes, mean 'with a force drawn from all parts of Greece.' ['No armament so magnificent or costly had ever been sent out by any single Hellenic power,' J.]

C. 31, 4 ξυνέβη δὲ πρὸς τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἅμα ἔρην γενέσθαι, ὥς τις ἕκαστος προσετάχθη, καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας ἐπιδείξιν μᾶλλον εἰκασθῆναι τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐξουσίας ἢ ἐπὶ πολέμου παρασκευῇ.

'The result was that among themselves they fell to quarrelling at their posts (as to who was best equipped for the expedition), while to the Greeks at large (through the splendour of the equipment) a display was portrayed of their (internal) power and (external) influence rather than a force equipped against an enemy.'

(1) πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔρην γενέσθαι is not merely 'there was rivalry amongst them in the matter of arms,' etc.; much less, as some suppose, 'they strove to be best at their duties.' In ii. 54 ἐγένετο ἔρις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ λοιμὸν ὀνομάσθαι . . . ἀλλὰ λοιμὸν is 'they disputed whether λοιμός and not λοιμός was the word.' In ii. 21 κατὰ ξυστάσεις γιγνόμενοι ἐν πολλῇ ἐρίδι ἦσαν is 'they gathered in groups and quarrelled.' In iii. 111 ἦν πολλὴ ἔρις καὶ ἄγνοια εἴτε Ἀμπρακιώτης τίς ἐστιν εἴτε Πελοποννήσιος is 'they quarrelled in their ignorance.' The only other passage in which ἔρις occurs in Thuc. is c. 35 of this book, where the meaning is clearly 'disputed hotly.' So in our passage the sense must be 'as they stood waiting to embark, they disputed as to which man's equipment was the best.'

(2) ἐπιδείξιν ἡκασθῆναι ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας is by no means 'to the rest of the Greeks the expedition resembled a grand display.' Thucydides is describing the start of the expedition, not the effect that the news of it produced on the Greeks: he tells not what the Greeks thought on that day, but what the Athenians were doing. 'The rest of the Greeks' were not there to see what the expedition looked like. The words can mean only 'a display intended for the rest of Greece was portrayed rather than an armament directed against an enemy.' Thus (1) and (2) present two aspects of one and the same picture, the two being closely connected—the ἔρις among themselves and the ἐπιδείξιν to Greece. ['While at home the Athenians were thus competing with one another in the performance of their several duties, to the rest of Hellas the expedition seemed to be a grand display of their power and greatness,' J.]

* C. 46, 2 τῷ μὲν Νικίᾳ προσδεχομένῳ ἦν τὰ παρὰ τῶν Ἑγεσταιῶν, τοῖν δὲ ἑτέροις καὶ ἀλογώτερα.

'By Nicias the news from S. was expected; to the other two it was even more unaccountable than unexpected.'

The length to which Thuc. carries ellipse has been dealt with in great detail by L. Herbst. With the comparative ellipse is especially common. Here the ellipse is to

be filled up from προσδεχομένη ἦν—οὐ μόνον ἀπροσδόκητα ἦν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλογώτερα. ['Nicias expected that the Eggestaeans would fail them; to the two others their behaviour appeared even more incomprehensible than the defection of the Rhegians,' J.]

* C. 69, 1 ὅμως δὲ οὐκ ἂν οἰόμενοι σφίσι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους προτέρους ἐπελθεῖν καὶ διὰ τάχους ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀμύνασθαι ἀναλαβόντες τὰ ὅπλα εὐθὺς ἀντεπῆσαν. 'Nevertheless, though they did not expect that the A. would make an attack on them, and that they would suddenly by compulsion defend themselves, they took up their arms,' etc.

ἀναγκαζόμενοι is part of the predicate with ἀμύνασθαι: ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀμυνόμεθα = 'we are forced to defend ourselves,' οἰόμενοι governs ἀμύνασθαι, and ἂν extends to it. The editors make ἀναγκαζόμενοι govern ἀμύνασθαι—in which case, as Stahl sees, the participle ought to be *causal* to make sense. ['They were compelled to make a hasty defence, for they never imagined that the Athenians would begin the attack. Nevertheless they took up their arms,' J.]

* C. 82, 2 τὸ μὲν οὖν μέγιστον μαρτύριον αὐτὸς εἶπεν, ὅτι οἱ Ἴωνες αἰεὶ ποτε πολέμοι τοῖς Δωριεῦσιν εἰσιν. ἔχει δὲ καὶ οὕτως. ἡμεῖς γὰρ Ἴωνες ὄντες Πελοποννησίους Δωριεῦσι, καὶ πλείοσιν οὕσι καὶ παρικοῦσιν, ἐσκεψάμεθα ὅτῳ τρόπῳ ἡκιστ' αὐτῶν ὑπακουσόμεθα.

'He himself has borne the strongest witness by saying that the Ionians are always enemies to the Dorians. Moreover, the case stands exactly as follows. We being Ionians to the Peloponnesians who are Dorians and superior in numbers and near neighbours, considered the best way of avoiding dependence on them.'

(1) ἔχει δὲ καὶ οὕτως refers to what follows, not to what precedes. The *general* principle 'Ionians *versus* Dorians' is enough to justify Athens. But there are *special* circumstances, as he explains in the next sentence.

(2) Ἴωνες ὄντες Πελοποννησίους go together. Πελοποννησίους is not governed by ὑπακουσόμεθα. He has said 'Ἴωνες are πολέμοι Δωριεῦσι': now for πολέμοι he substitutes Ἴωνες. 'The Dorians regarded us as Ionians, and therefore as enemies and inferiors over whom they were to rule.' This dative Πελοποννησίους is 'the person judging.' ['We Ionians dwelling in the neighbourhood of the Peloponnesians, etc.,' J.]

* C. 82, 3 αὐτοὶ δὲ τῶν ὑπὸ βασιλεῖ πρότερον ὄντων ἡγεμόνες καταστάντες οἰκοῦμεν.

'We being established as leaders of the cities that were formerly under the great king's power ourselves control them.' τῶν . . ὄντων is neut., not masc.; οἰκοῦμεν = διοι-

κοῦμεν, as in tragedy often, and is trans., sc. αὐτά, i.e. τὰ . . πρότερον ὄντα. For the inanimate with ὑπό cf. iii. 62 τὴν ἡμετέραν χώραν περιωμένον ὑφ' αὐτοῖς ποιείσθαι: and for ἡγεμόνων with an inanimate cf. i. 4 τῶν Κυκλάδων ἤρξε . . τοὺς ἐαυτοῦ παῖδας ἡγεμόνας ἐγκαταστήσας: ib. 25 (Κορινθίους τῆς πόλεως) ἡγεμόνας ποιείσθαι. In i. 75, it is true, we have προσελθόντων τῶν ξυμμάχων καὶ αὐτῶν δεηθέντων ἡγεμόνας καταστήναι, and in i. 95 ἡξίουν αὐτοῖς ἡγεμόνας σφῶν γενέσθαι: but in the present passage the use of οἰκοῦμεν shows that the neut. is intended. ['We then assumed the leadership of the king's former subjects which we still retain,' J.]

C. 87, 3 καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴθ' ὥς δικασταὶ γερόμενοι τῶν ἡμῖν ποιουμένων μὴθ' ὥς σωφρονισταὶ ἀποτρέπεν πειρᾶσθε.

'Now do not you sit in judgment on our conduct nor try by chastisement to divert us from it,' i.e. from our settled line of action.

The whole of the context in which this occurs refers to the conduct and habits of Athenians—what is called below their πολυπραγμοσύνη καὶ τρόπος, their 'intermeddling, or rather character.' Hence τῶν ἡμῖν ποιουμένων does not refer merely to the intervention in Sicily ('our enterprise'), but to the settled course of action on which Athens had started long before. 'If you refuse to aid us,' says Euphemus, 'you virtually attempt to censure the Athenian imperial policy,' and it is far too late to do that. The speaker had started with a defence of that policy, and that defence is most ingeniously bound up with the appeal for the support of Camarina. ['Do not sit in judgment upon our actions, or seek to school us into moderation and so divert us from our purpose,' i.e. the purpose of interfering in Sicily, J.]

* C. 87, 4 ὅ τε οἰόμενος ἀδικήσεσθαι καὶ ὁ ἐπιβουλευὼν διὰ τὸ ἐτοιμὴν ὑπείναι ἐλπίδα τῷ μὲν ἀντιτυχεῖ ἐπικουρίας ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τῷ δέ, εἰ ἤξομεν, μὴ ἀδεεῖ [with Krüger for MSS. ἀδεεῖς] εἶναι κινδυνεύειν, ἀμφότεροι ἀναγκάζονται ὁ μὲν ἄκων σωφρονεῖν, ὁ δ' ἀπραγμόνως σφύζεσθαι.

'The man who thinks that he will suffer wrong and he who plots mischief, because they feel a lively expectation, the one of obtaining from us a return in the form of help, the other that if we come he will be in danger of not escaping unpunished, are both alike compelled, the one to restrain himself against his will, the other to accept safety without taking action.'

For ἐλπίς ἀντιτυχεῖν . . κινδυνεύειν it is enough to refer to Stahl *QG.*² p. 7. ἀντιτυχεῖν means 'to obtain something as a return (for joining our alliance),' and *not* 'to obtain

redress for a wrong'; for the commission of the wrong, as the context shows, is to be prevented, not punished. *κινδυνεύειν μὴ ἀδεεῖ εἶναι* = 'to be in danger of not going unpunished.' In *ἀδεεῖ* there is an allusion to the technical meaning of *ἀδεια*, which is a prospective remission of any pains and penalties that may be incurred by violating τὸ κύριον. The argument is that even before Athens had intervened in any state, a plotter who intended a crime against his opponents would have to think whether he might not be giving occasion for Athens to intervene; and whether he would not find that Athens took the same view of the crime after its committal that she would have taken if her influence had already been established in that state before the crime was committed: she might take the view that the crime was against her, as champion of all oppressed Greeks, and that she had not consented to the crime; and hence she would exact the full penalty.

In this passage the speaker is describing the effect of Athenian *prestige*, felt even in parts of the Greek world where she had not intervened. Her *prestige* is a safeguard for the tranquillity of the Greeks. *ἀναγκάζονται* is with some humour applied to those who anticipate oppression as well as to those who intend a crime. Both sides 'are compelled' to abstain from action by this moral force. [J.'s rendering gives the general sense correctly, but he wrongly renders (1) *ἀντι-χεῖν* 'to obtain redress'; (2) *μὴ ἀδεεῖ εἶναι* *κινδυνεύειν* 'he may well be alarmed for the consequences'; (3) *σφίζεσθαι ἀπραγμόνως* 'a

deliverance at our hands that costs him nothing.' Euphemus means, *not* that Athens steps in, but that in consequence of her *prestige* tranquillity is obtained *without* her active interference.]

* C. 89, 6 ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγινώσκωμεν οἱ φρονούντες τι καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον, ὅσῳ κἂν [for MSS. καὶ] λοιδορήσαιμι.

'For the nature of democracy was known to those of us who had any insight, and I should show the superiority of my insight by the amount of abuse I might pour on it.' But, he continues, there is nothing new to say, and it would only be flogging a dead horse to abuse democracy.

To οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον supply, *not* γινώσκειμι, as the editors do, but φρονόειν. It would be, says Alcibiades, an obviously prudent thing for me here at Sparta to abuse democracy; the more I abused it, the more you would admire my φρόνησις. But all I need say is that it is an 'admitted folly.' Herbst explains the passage as intended to represent οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον (γινώσκειμι), ὅσῳ καὶ (οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον) λοιδορήσαιμι, 'and I just so much better than others as I should have more right than others to attack it.' But surely such a brachylogy is unintelligible. Several editors think something is lost after ὅσῳ καί. Fr. Müller regards the text as hopeless. ['Of course, like all sensible men, we knew only too well what democracy is, and I better than any one, who have so good reason for abusing it, i.e. because I have been so unjustly treated by it,' J.]

E. C. MARCHANT.

NOTES ON THEOCRITUS.

XXII. 8.

νηὼν θ' αἰ δύνοντα καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἐξανίοντα
ἀστρα βιαζόμεναι χαλεποῖς ἐνέκυρσαν ἀήταις.

οὐρανοῦ ἐξανίοντα must be understood as 'rising up in the sky:' but the ἐξ of the compound is then meaningless, and in conjunction with the genitive οὐρανοῦ obscure. Read οὐρανὸν ἐξανίοντα (οὐρανὸν ἐξανίοντα Hermann): cf. Eur. *Orest.* 1685 πόλον ἐξανύσας.

XXI., 59. οὐκέτι after ὥμοσα may be justified by Herondas 6, 93 ὃ δ' ὥμοσε οὐκ ἂν εἰπῆν μοι. (ὦ . . σε Papyrus.)

I. 56.

αιπολικὸν τι θέαμα, τέρας κέ τυ θυμὸν ἀτύξαι (so vulg.): θέαμα due to Heinsius: θέαμα MSS. αιπολικὸν cannot be right: we want a word complimentary to the value of the cup, not disparaging or limiting it to one class: and why 'a sight for goatherds,' when it is to be given to Thyrsis! Ahrens' αιολιχὸν is equally out of place: we do not want a diminutive.

Αιολικόν — Aeolian — might stand if Aeolian cups were specially famous; of this there is no evidence.

Scholl. k has αιολικόν. αιολίζειν γὰρ τὸ ἀπατᾶν...αιῶλον τι καὶ ποίκιλον θέαμα. This

is just the sense required and seems to have been too lightly rejected. αἰολικός is not an impossible formation. Cf. πρόδρομος—προδρομικός: ἀπλοῖκος: βάρβαρος—βαρβαρικός—βαρβαρίζω etc. and there seems to be an imitation of the line in Apoll. Rhod. 1, 765

κείνους κ' εἰσπορόων ἀκέοις, ψεύδοιό τε
θυμὸν,
ἐλπόμενος πυκινὴν τιν' ἀπὸ σφείων ἑστακούσαι
βάξιν.

So here, if αἰολικὸν can be admitted, it would = deceptive; cf. Pindar's αἰόλον ψεύδος and χρῆσμων αἰόλον στόμα (= riddling), Lycoph. 4.

XXX. 3 sqq.

κάλω μὲν μετρίως ἀλλ' ὅπόσον τῷ παιδὶ περιέχει
καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ κακὸν ταῖς μὲν ἔχει, ταῖς δ' οὐ.
τὰς γὰς τοῦτο χάρις· ταῖς δὲ παράνυλαις γλυκὺ
μεΐδιμα.

Most of the editors have transposed lines 4 and 5: see Ziegler *ad loc.* and Hiller p. 355 [add Haeberlin in *Philologus* 46]. Mähly gives ἀλλ' ὅπόσον παῖδα περιέρρει ἄβας τοῦτο χάρις, which is attractive but does not give the right antithesis to κάλω μὲν μετρίως. Buecheler (*Rhein. Mus.* 30) suggests τῷ ποδὶ περιέρρει τὰς γὰς τοῦτο χάρις, and points out a similar confusion of πόδα and παῖδα in Bion. *Ep. Adon.* 24. But surely τῷ ποδὶ is strange Greek.

Following up Buecheler's suggestion, I propose
μᾶκος μὲν μετρίω, ἀλλ' ὅπόσον τῷ πεδῷ περιέρρει
τὰς γὰς, τοῦτο χάρις.

For sense cf. *Anth. Pal.* xii. 93

ὄστε καθ' ὕψος
οὐ μέγας, οὐρανὴν δ' ἀμφιτέθλε χάρις.

πεδὰ and παῖδα are confused in Theocr. 29, 38 (πέδα vulg. παῖδα k. c. πεδὰ Hermann).

The use of τῷ πεδῷ = 'with such height as he possesses,' would be parallel to the use of μετὰ or σὺν expressing accompanying conditions, e.g. Xen. *Symp.* 2, 15 καλὸς ὁ παῖς ὢν ὁμῶς σὺν τοῖς στήμασιν ἔτι καλλίων φαίνεται.

περρέρχει = ὑπερέρχει, *vid.* Ahrens, *dial.* i. p. 151.

I. 105 sqq.

That there has been interpolation here is universally admitted. The only question is how much is to be rejected. If 106 and

107 are both spurious it is hard to see why they should have been inserted, even by 'a late grammarian or sophist.' If 106 is sound, the introduction of 107 from the parallel passage in 5, 46 is easily explained. But *τηνῇ δρύϊς ὧδε κύπειρος* cannot be right; unless we adopt the very forced interpretation that *τηνῇ δρύϊς ὧδε κύπειρος* is a proverbial expression = that place is better than this. This does not suit 5, 45. The common interpretation, 'hic tantum modo humilis ulva quae vix te tegat' (Paley) is not true (*vid.* Theocr. 13, 35) and is totally unsuited to the passage. Ribbeck reads *τοῦτῃ* for *τηνῇ* as in 5, 45 (*Rhein. Mus.* 17). I suggest *τηνῇ δρύϊς ἔνθα κύπειρος*, with omission of next line. *ἔνθα* would be altered to *ὧδε* by reminiscence of 5, 45 and line 107 inserted from the same cause. The passage from Plutarch *Quaest. Nat.* Latin version p. 1126, which Meineke quotes, points to *ἔνθα* as the reading found by Plutarch (*quercus atque cupirus*).

The sense of the whole passage is 'you are not invincible, Kypris, though you boast of your victory over me: you have only triumphed over shepherds and herdsmen, Anchises, Adonis, Daphnis [note emphatic *βουκόλος*, 105, *βοῦταν* 113, *μᾶλα* 109]. Go then to Anchises, and your pleasant haunts on Ida [this is the force of *τηνῇ...κύπειρος*]: Adonis too is ripe for your love, since he too feeds the sheep. Then (*αὐθις*) go to the battle-field and see whether your easy victories over us will avail you. You could not conquer Diomedes, and even Daphnis *κῆν* 'Αἶδα κακὸν ἑσσεταί ἄλγος ἔρωτι.'

αὐθις is not 'a second time' but 'then,' 'after that': cf. Dem. *Ol.* 1, 13. Soph. *O.* 7. 1402 etc.

Paley gives the right sense in his note on 112 *ὅπως στ. sc.* si putas te invictam esse quia vincis pastores, but is wrong on 109: 'Sententia est "si vis pastores vexare, en tibi Anchisen et Adoniden."' The whole passage is not a plea for pity, but a bitter taunt at Kypris, and her fancied strength; and lines 105 sqq. must be taken in close connection with the defiance that has preceded.

Fritzsche's 'ipsa Venus pastoris amore victa cum sit, non est quod dea Daphnidem pastorem a se victum esse gloriatur' makes the fatal mistake of totally confusing the ideas of victory and defeat as they would appear to Kypris.

R. J. CHOLMELEY.

Manchester, May 1896.

THE MADRID MS. OF ASCONIUS [M. 81].

THE commentary of Asconius upon certain of Cicero's speeches possesses great interest, not only on account of the information which it contains, but also from the romantic circumstances attending its discovery. It was, as is well known, found at St. Gallen by Poggio in 1416 together with a portion of Valerius Flaccus, Manilius, the *Silvae* of Statius, and Quintilian. In a celebrated letter he relates how the MSS. were discovered 'in a noisome and dark dungeon, a cellar under a tower, not fit to receive a criminal condemned to death.' He copied them, as he says, '*mea manu et quidem velociter*,' in order to send them to his friends, Leonardo Aretino and Niccolo the Florentine. The original *codices* discovered by Poggio on this occasion have disappeared, and in the case of Asconius we are entirely dependent upon copies derived from the lost MS.

Modern research has established that, besides the copy of Asconius made by Poggio, two others were made by friends who were with him at the time. One of these was written by Zomini, or Sozomenus, the ecclesiastical historian, and the other by Bartolomaeo de Montepoliciano. Curiously enough the apographs made by Poggio's friends both survive, while that of Poggio is lost. It was, however, from this that most of MSS. of Asconius now in existence were copied, since its connexion with Poggio gave it commanding authority. Kiessling and Schöll, however, who in their admirable edition give the readings of the MS. of Sozomenus [S], and that of Montepoliciano [M], as well as those of several MSS. derived from the Poggian fount, show conclusively that Sozomenus was the most conscientious of the three friends, and that in a multitude of cases he gives an original reading where Poggio's fertile imagination led him to emend. Next in accuracy they place Montepoliciano, and last Poggio. This conclusion was indeed inevitable since the two Poggian MSS. which they used chiefly are not the purest members of the family.

The best of these they style Pb, a Florentine MS. which has not been interpolated from Cicero in the same way as most of its congeners, and is therefore nearer to the common archetype. The other, Pa, is the best of the interpolated MSS. Another MS. which they consider still better, but of which they do not give a full collation, is the

Leidensis, Pl. This they only obtained after their work was already finished. A few readings are quoted in the notes, and some others given in the Preface and Addenda, which sufficiently show it to be nearer to the parent stock than Pb. They also refer to other inferior MSS. Pc, Pg, and Pw, the *editio princeps*. I have myself looked at the British Museum MSS. which I found to possess no value. Recently I examined in the Paris library two interesting MSS. One of these, 7832, is a *gemellus* of Pb, and throws considerable light upon the history of this MS. I refer to it subsequently under the name of π . The other, 7833, a copy in cursive made by a scholar for his own use, is one of the few MSS. not derived from the recension of Poggio. The subscription at the end agrees with some slight variations with that of Montepoliciano's copy. The readings, however, so far as I was able to examine it, are those of Sozomenus, except that in some cases an obvious conjecture has been admitted.

Kiessling and Schöll also refer to a Madrid MS. in terms calculated to excite the curiosity of the reader. Knust, quoted in Pertz's *Archiv*, states that it once belonged to Poggio, but appears to have no other ground for saying so beyond the fact that it has the 'scriptio,' '*Hoc fragmentum . . . Poggii Florentinus*.' They prudently refuse to attach importance to this *scriptio*, since there is no proof of its genuineness. As a matter of fact it appears in a number of MSS. of Asconius, some of these being of very late date. Thilo notes that it is also found in a Vatican MS. of Valerius Flaccus, where he refuses to recognize the hand of Poggio. The 'scriptio,' then proves nothing. On the other hand they attach great importance to the fact that Valerius Flaccus forms part of the same volume, the two works having been found by Poggio at the same time: and say that, if it could be established that it really had belonged to Poggio, they would regard it as the chief or indeed the only authority for the Poggian recension. As it is, knowing nothing of its readings, they suspend judgment.

The MS. in question originally was bound up with another, M. 31, also containing two works discovered by Poggio. On the first page of this is entered 'Manilii Astronomicon. Statii Papinii Sylvae. Asconius Pedianus in Ciceronem, Valerii Flacci non-

nulla.' The last two were afterwards struck out, this obviously having been done when they were bound up separately. The Manilius was examined by Professor Robinson Ellis, who published a full collation of it in the *Classical Review* for 1893, as well as an article upon it in *Hermathena* for the same year, and found it to be of great value. Knowing that I have for some time been interested in the text of Asconius, he strongly urged me to pay a visit to Madrid, and to examine the MS., which I did during the Easter Vacation. I would here mention that I had no hope of obtaining equally important results. In the case of Manilius Prof. Ellis established that the Sangallensis family, as represented by the Madrid MS., contains a number of good readings not found in the Gemblacensis. In that of Asconius we have no MSS. not derived from the Sangallensis, and the only possible result was to throw some further light upon the affinities of MSS. none of which are earlier than the fifteenth century.

I proceed at once to state the conclusion at which I arrived. The Madrid MS. [μ] is the oldest of the Poggian group. Pb, the MS. chiefly used by KS., is copied directly from it; all the Poggian MSS. can be explained from it. That it was written by Poggio himself I do not venture to assert: it is, however, highly probable that certain notes in the margin were written by him.

As to the relation between the two MSS., M. 31 and 81, I think it certain that they are not in the same hand. The Asconius and Valerius Flaccus are written in clearer and more regular characters. If there is any difference in age, which I do not assert, I should consider this MS. to be older than the other. Besides Asconius and Valerius Flaccus the MS. contains the 'Sigiberti chronicon.' This is written more hurriedly, and with a number of abbreviations. I should not, however, like to assert that it does not come from the scribe who wrote the rest of the volume.

In the Asconius the original text has seldom been tampered with, and any alterations are easily detected from the difference in the ink. Several superscriptions are entered by the first hand, sometimes in smaller characters, and sometimes in letters equal in size to those employed in the text. These are of some importance as showing that the writer had before him an already corrected original. A number of other hands can be recognized in the superscriptions, marginal additions, and notes. Some of these are comparatively modern, e.g. in

several places lacunae are filled up in thicker ink; others are ancient, and probably contemporary. Among the latter may be classed several conjectures, written in a cursive hand, introduced by *credo*, or *c^a*. Thus 27, 7 in *quas tria patrimonia effudisse eum Cicero significat*, for *patrim.* the first hand gives *prelia* [with S], in the margin is written in straggling characters '*credo, patrimonia*.' There are also some comments, possibly in the same hand, which are of great interest.

KS. [p. xxxvi] remark of certain notes found in the margin of Pb and several other MSS. that they would appear to have been originally written by Poggio in his MS., '*inter scribendum*.' They quote from Pb the following, 76, 10 '*cicero in quadam ad atticum epistola scribit de catiline defensione quam facere cogitabat*,' and 78, 6 '*vincis me: itaque puto non defendisse, sed tantum de defendendo cogitasse, quod per epistolam negari non potest*.' Those in Pb are of course entered by the first hand. In π , the Paris *gemellus* of Pb, the first does not occur, but the second is entered in margin by the first hand as a variant. In μ both these notes are written in the margin in the curious and rather illegible cursive to which I have already referred, being obviously notes scrawled down by the original owner of the MS. Whether or no the author of them was Poggio, according to the guess of KS., it is at least certain that their author was at one time the possessor of the MS. Several old editors, including Hotoman, finding these words in MSS. of the Pb family, adapted them by omitting *vincis me* and incorporating the rest of the remark into the text, where they remained until they were expelled by Baiter. It is somewhat remarkable that in the case of a work discovered in the fifteenth century a *scholium* from the margin should in a few years have become part of the *textus receptus*.

This single instance is sufficient to prove that Pb and π are derived from μ . It is not the only one in which marginal notes in μ reappear in this family, e.g. 27, 7 the previously quoted '*credo patrimonia*' is reproduced in the margin of π by the first hand. Of the two MSS. π would seem to represent an earlier stage in the recension than Pb: thus in 1, 17 in *summo cum dicat*, $\mu\pi$ give in *senatu summa*, Pb [and Pa] in *senatu*. I add a few more instances to illustrate further the formation of the text in Pb.

30, 6. *familiam Hypsaei et Q. Pompeii*

postulavit : In SM there is no lacuna : in μ *postulavit* ends a paragraph (in *med. lin.*), in Pb a lacuna is marked.

35, 17. *coponem*] *coponem* SM, *coponē* μ , *coponere* Pb.

38, 22. *si cui non omnes eas probantur* : *eae* S, *ēē* M. *ēē* μ , *ex*, Pb, a misinterpretation of *ēē* [i.e. *eae*].

59, 8. *prohibebat* : *prohibebant* SM.

Prohibebant μ , m. 1 : *per prohibebant* Pb.

It is a curious fact that in one place Pb retains an earlier reading than μ : viz. p. 5, 1.

perduellionis reo : here Pb with SM gives *perduellio* . . . , in $\mu\pi$ the lacuna is filled up, although in μ there is a small space left after *reo*, which appears to show that the writer first left a lacuna, and then afterwards filled it up.

To come next to Pa. That this is a very inferior MS. to Pb is obvious from Kiessling's notes : that it also was derived from μ appears highly probable. I quote the following.

64, 10. *una modo supererat ut* : μ with SPb. gives *una modo* ; in the margin of μ the first hand gives *mens esset ut* : Pa has *una mens esset ut modo*.

42, 5. *reddidit* ; *reddidit* SM, *reddidit* μ , the *-di-* being struck out. The line through *-i-* is very faint. Pa *reddidit*.

75, 8. *negat* : *negabat* SPb, in μ the last *-a* is very small and might easily be read as *i* : *negabit* Pa.

The general formula which expresses the relation of Pb and Pa to μ is, that Pb reproduces both the first and second hand in μ , whereas Pa gives the second hand only.

I give a few instances to illustrate the difference in the two recensions :

46, 7. *unum eum excuti priusquam in senatum intraret, iusserat* :

For *unum* μ gives *unum* (m. 1), π *si unum*, *sinum* Pab *unum*. After *intraret* SM μ insert *priusquam* ; in the mg. of μ the first hand adds *clodium*. Pb gives *intraret clodium* priusquam, Pa *intraret clodium*.

56, 16. *facta pactio est, ut neque arbitrium de libertate perageretur, rediret tamen ille in libertatem de quo agebatur, neque Metellus* : in this very corrupt passage μ gives *facta pactione* [concordia M : S] *ut neque Metellum*, and in the margin the first hand adds, *arbitrium de libertate peregerunt*

sed tamen ille in libertate de quo. The substitution of *pactione* for *concordia* appears in all the Poggian MSS. They also incorporate the marginal addition, but in π this

is prefixed by a significant *l*, viz. *facta pactione l arbitrium* *peregerunt*. Pa and π omit *ut*, underlined in μ , Pb retains it.

65, 16. *nactus* :

ob
non tuus μ , s.l. m. 1, *ob tunc* Pa, *ob non tunc* Pb.

66, 11. *nisi poena accessisset in divisores, extinguere ambitum nullo modo posse* :

accessisse SM, *accessisse* μ , *accessisset* Pab.

extincti S, *extinct* M, *extinct* μ Pb, *extinguere* Pa.

ullo S, *ullo*, μ Pb, *nullo* Pa.

ib. 13. *idque iure ut docti sumus* :

et rebus S, *in rebus* M μ , in mg. μ , *vir is*, *vir is* in *rebus*, Pb. *vir is* Pa.

76, 27. *tam male de populo Romano existimare* :

malecie tr. SM, *male cie* tr. μ , in mg. 'c de re p.'

de rep.

male cie Pb, *male de re p.* Pa.

83, 2. *qui posteaquam illo < quo > conati sunt* :

illo S, om. M, *illo* μ , *illud* Pa, *de illo* Pa.

The other important MS. of the Poggian family is Pl. I have some difficulty in dealing with this, since KS. only published some select readings. That it represents a later stage than μ in the development of this recension is however obvious. KS. mention several cases in which the first hand gives in place of the corruption found in the *Sangallensis* a correction taken from Cicero. I instance the following :—

6, 13. *sed ille designatus cos. cum* : so Pl from Cicero [Pa].

sic ille desicco si cum μ , with SM, the correction being given in μ s.l. by m. 2.

2, 7. *mehercule, ut dici audiebam te*, Pl from Cicero [Pa].

he SM, and μ , in which the second hand has entered the correction.

12, 25. *o amentem Paulum* : Pl from Cicero [Pa].

so ornamentum S, *so ornamentum* μ .

13, 7. *flagravit* : Pl from Cicero.

..... SM μ , *flagravit* μ ².

In a large number of instances Pl has the reading of the second hand in μ , or a marginal reading. I do not mention these, since it might be argued that they had been copied into μ from Pl. The following case is more decisive :—

43, 24. *familiarissimus* et *idem comes* : et *idem*, om. SM.

KS. quote as one of three unique variants from Pl its reading here,

familiaris meus et idem comes.

In μ we find

et *idem*

familiarissimus meus comes μ , both alterations coming from the first hand. This appears to definitely prove that μ was also the archetype of Pl.

Having thus disposed of the three important MSS. Pa, Pb, and Pl, I do not propose to apply the same method to the inferior ones still remaining, e.g. Pc, Pg, P ω . They contain nothing original, and merely represent successive stages in the process of degeneracy. It appears to me certain that they together with the three better MSS. are derived from the Madrid MS. I proceed to collect the results of this discussion.

In the first place, in a future critical edition of Asconius, a good deal of complexity should disappear. The multitude of Poggian MSS. may be disregarded, and their place taken by the single MS. μ . Besides this negative result we gain a certain amount of fresh evidence, since we obtain more authentic testimony to the readings of the Sangallensis from the third witness, who, if he was less careful than Sozomenus to give the exact reading of the archetype, was at any rate the best scholar, and probably the most expert palaeographer of the three friends. By a comparison of SM and μ we are able with considerable certainty to reconstitute the lost Sangallensis. There is not much to glean in the way of new readings, although I have noted a certain number. In several cases also conjectures made by subsequent scholars are already found in the margin or above the line in μ .

It will be observed that I have not attempted to identify μ with the original copy made by Poggio at St. Gallen. That it should be this is out of the question, since Poggio in making his copy wrote '*velociter*' i.e. in cursive, whereas μ is written with care and in a literary hand. He would of course copy out at his leisure his rough copy, or have this done for him. That in μ we have the fair copy then made is, I think, extremely probable. Specimens of Poggio's writing appear to be rare. Thilo says that he was unable to find an autograph at Rome. I have looked in vain for it in London, Paris, and Madrid. Schmidt asserts that a Berlin MS. of the letters to Atticus was written by him, but I have not seen this. De Nohlac gives a specimen in his work on

the library of Fulvio Orsini, but does not say from what source it comes. It does not, however, seem to be the same hand as that in which μ is written. I should be inclined to guess that Poggio employed some one to make his 'fair copy' for him. This theory is supported by the fact that, as I previously remarked, superscriptions occur in μ which the scribe appears to have found in the MS. before him. On the other hand, it is only fair to remark that in some places the writer appears to be conjecturing as he goes along. I mention the following instance :—

74, 1. *tamen multum poterant* :

tamen...tum poterat S.

tamen... (in fin. l.) multum poterant μ [multum MP].

This looks as if he was filling up a blank, and at first tried *plurimum*, then, finding that it would not do, wrote *multum*. It may, however, be merely a slip, or he may be reproducing a dittography already existing in Poggio's rough copy. Further knowledge of Poggio's hand is necessary before one can pronounce upon this point. The substantial conclusion arrived at by internal evidence is that in μ we have the oldest and apparently the archetype of all the Poggian family.

I also collated the portion of Valerius Flaccus, i.-iv. 317, contained in this MS. In the case of this author the problem is of a different character, since we possess other evidence for the text in addition to the copies of the Sangallensis. The great MS. is Vat. 3277, of the ninth century [V], containing all eight books. Also Carrion, the Belgian scholar, published a number of readings in his edition of 1565 from a *codex* for which he claims similar antiquity. His *fides* has, however, been suspected by many scholars. Thilo, who is followed by Baehrens, disbelieves in Carrion's MS., which he considers to show tokens of Italian ingenuity, and also declares that the *Sangallensis* itself was copied from V. The representatives of the Sangallensis which he uses are three in number: (i.) M, a Munich MS., highly corrected, (ii.) P, a Vatican MS., Ottoboni 1258, and (iii.) another MS. found in the same library, Vat. 1613, π . The only real discovery which I made is that the last of these, π , is copied directly from μ . The proof of this is simple. In π there is a large omission in bk. ii. of eighty-two lines, ll. 324-406. These occupy exactly two pages in μ , viz. 78b and 79a. It is therefore obvious that the scribe missed out two pages by mistake. The similarity between μ and P' is very great. In both MSS. a second hand has made a large number of alterations,

and in μ the reading of the first hand is often difficult to read. It appeared to me, however, that in P and μ the reading of the first hand was generally or always the same, and that any alteration which had taken place was also common to both MSS. I have not yet been able to go through my collation, but, if judged by the test of omissions, it would seem that μ is the older, since it has several lines omitted in P,

whereas I found no instance of the contrary occurrence. I attach no importance to M, in which the readings of the second hand in μ are followed, and which is obviously a later MS. It is therefore highly probable that for Valerius Flaccus also we have in μ the earliest representative of the Poggian recension.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

NOTE ON ZOSIMUS, V. 46.

ἔταξε καὶ Γενέριδον τῶν ἐν Δαλματίᾳ πάντων ἡγείσθαι, ὄντα στρατηγὸν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων † ὅσαι Παιονίας τε † τὰς ἄνω καὶ Νωρικοὺς καὶ Ραιτοὺς ἐφύλαττον.

THE first corruption was nearly healed by Mendelssohn who proposed (see *ad loc.*) ἰλῶν, a word used by the author elsewhere, for ἄλλων: only we may keep ἄλλων. The second corruption is not healed either by τὰ ἄνω or by Παιονίαν τε τὴν ἄνω (an example of

the same uncritical method which substitutes ὅσαι for ὅσαι). The following words, Νωρικοὺς καὶ Ραιτοὺς, show that Παιονίας is a corruption for Παιόνας (cp. ii. 33), of which τὰς for τοὺς was the further consequence. The restored passage runs:

ὄντα στρατηγὸν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰλῶν ὅσαι Παιόνας τε τοὺς ἄνω καὶ Νωρικοὺς καὶ Ραιτοὺς ἐφύλαττον.

J. B. BURY.

PALMER'S EDITION OF CATULLUS, AND MENOZZI ON CATULLUS.

Catulli Veronensis Liber, edited by ARTHUR PALMER, Professor of Latin in the University of Dublin. Macmillan. (Parnassus Library.) 3s. 6d. net.
De Catulli Carm. XLIX. et LXXXV. commentationes duas scripsit EULETHERIUS MENOZZI. Trani. 1895.

Of the two dissertations by Menozzi the first deals with the short poem to Cicero, *Disertissime Romuli nepotum*. Menozzi considers these lines to Cicero ironical, and the occasion which caused them as follows. Cicero had been defending Vatinius and had used the occasion to attack Calvus who was prosecuting him. In the course of his attack he had used words to this effect '*At hi pessimi poetae qui Vatiniū aggređiuntur*,' including in *pessimi poetae* Calvus and his intimate literary friend Catullus. Catullus, incensed at a charge which involved both his friend and himself, could not allow the attack to remain unanswered. The exaggerated tone of the poem from first to

last, *Disertissime...Quot sunt quotque fuere...Quotque post aliis erunt in annis—Gratias maximas—pessimus omnium poeta—optimus omnium patronus*, is intended to convey, and does convey, an unmistakable sarcasm. The recurrence of the words *pessimus omnium poeta*, *Tanto pessimus omnium poeta*, would be just what we should expect after such a provocation. Catullus has repeated Cicero's words, and dextrously turned them to his own advantage. 'You call us the worst of poets. I acknowledge myself to be the worst of poets, in the same proportion as I acknowledge you to be the best of pleaders,' meaning in Menozzi's words '*neque sum equidem poetarum omnium pessimus, ut me et Calvum praedicās, neque tu, ut putas, optimus omnium orator*.' This theory is not new, it is little more than an expansion of B. Schmidt's; but I am not aware that any one before Menozzi has suggested that the actual words *pessimi poetae* were used by Cicero in reference to Calvus and Catullus, and this on a public occasion,

when they would be more insulting and require a more directly allusive reply.

In his second dissertation Menozzi discusses xcv. *Zmyrna mei Cinnae* etc. Retaining *Hortensius uno* in 3, he considers the lost pentameter to have contained *uersuum* and *anno*: Hortensius to be the famous orator, born 114 B.C. Hortensius would seem to have published a long and inartistic poem at the same time at which Cinna published his short but nine years elaborated *Zmyrna*; Catullus took the occasion to contrast in a severe epigram, much of which is in all probability lost, the two schools of poetry which then divided the literary world of Rome; the older school, which cared little for finish and rejoiced in long annals or chronicles put into verse, and the newer which, in imitation of the Alexandrian poets, made finish everything and delighted in short bijoux of song. Menozzi thinks the *annals* of Hortensius, to which Velleius Paterculus alludes (ii. 16, 3), may have been in verse (like those of Volusius) and may have been the work spoken of in 3. Velleius however says that Hortensius *dilucide* in *annalibus suis* retulit an exploit of an ancestor of his own, one Minatius Magius, during the Social War: this can hardly refer to a poem; at least *dilucide* naturally explains itself of a detailed narrative in prose, in which all the circumstances of the episode were fully described.

Professor Palmer's Catullus challenges comparison, as regards externals, with Mr. Postgate's edition; both are elegant, and pleasing to the eye. Postgate however gave us a text and app. crit. alone: Palmer adds some introductory matter, a Life of the poet, remarks on the metres and diction, a section on the MSS., an Excursus on xvii. 1-4, lxviii. 135-142, and an Index.

Some of the emendations have already appeared in *Hermathena*; but there are many that are new, though perhaps none so striking as Palmer's correction of c. 6 *Perspecta est igni tum unica amicitia*. I will mention some of the more interesting. viii. 15 *Scelesta ne tu*, with which Palmer compares *Most.* 3, 1, 36 *ne ego sum miser, Scelestus, natus dis inimicis omnibus*. xi. 11 *Gallicum Rhenum horribilesque uultu in Usque Britannos*. xxix. 20 *Habenda Gallica ultima et Britannica?* sc. *praeda*. xxxviii. 2 Palmer allows, with Giri, the MS. reading to stand *Malest mi hercule et laboriose*. xlv. 8 *Hoc ut dixit, Amor manu sinistra Dextram sternuit approbationem*. xlv. 11 *Diuersae*

maria et uiae reportant. lvi. 7 *Protelo rigido meo cecidi* (not *rigida mea*). lxi. 151 *Quae tibi bene seruiat*. 179 *Iam bonae senibus uiris Cognitae bene feminae*. lxxiii. 78 *fac ut hunc furor abigat*. lxiv. 16 *Illac aequalis uiderunt luce marinas*. 24 *uos ego saepe mero, uos carmine compellabo*. 109 *Prona cadit late, rameis quaeque obuia frangens*. 119 *Quae misera in gremio gnatum deperdita alebat*. 320 *Hae tum clarisona pellentes aethera uoce*. lxv. 9 *Numquam ego te potero posthac audire loquentem*, a verse which might well come from Catullus. lxvi. 15 *anne maritum for a parentum*. 59 *Hic donum uario ne solum in lumine caeli*. lxvii. 12 *Verum istuc populi lingua quieta tacet*. lxviii. 60 *Per medium ludens transit iter populi*. 157 *Et qui principio nobis te tradidit auspex A quo sunt primo mi omnia nata bona*. lxxvi. 9, 10 *Omniaque* (not *Omnia quae*) *ingratae perierunt credita menti*. *Quare cur tu te iam amplius exerceas?* Palmer compares *Prop.* i. 3, 25 *Omniaque ingrato*. lxxvii. 6 *Vitae, heu non uerae pectus amicitiae*. This is a very interesting correction. It certainly seems impossible not to feel the force of the combination *pectus amicitiae*, and yet this ill accords with *heu heu nostrae*. Palmer's *heu non uerae* suits the words excellently. lxxxiii. 3, 4 *si nostri oblita taceret Suluia esset* 'which is a little nearer to *Sanna* or *Samia* of MSS. than *Sana*.' xcv. 3 *Milia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno* is thought by Palmer to be spurious. In 7 he supplies *poetae*. cxii. Palmer writes thus *Multus homo es, Naso, nec tecum multus homo cum Descendis: Naso, multus es et pathicus*. None of the poems has received more correction from Palmer than the last, cxvi. He gives it thus:—

Saepe tibi studioso animo uerba ante
requirens
carmina uti possem uertere Battiadae,
qui te lenirem nobis, neu conarere
tela infesta mihi mittere in usque caput,
hunc uideo mihi nunc frustra sumptum esse
laborem,
Gelli, nec nostras hic ualuisse preces.
Castra nos tela ista tua euitabimus apta:
at fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium.

I add here two suggestions of my own. vi. 12 *Nam in (ni) ista praeulet nihil tacere*. Possibly in this strangely vitiated line, not *nil stupra*, but *nil uerpa*, is concealed: *uerpa* spelt backwards is a preu. How the word came to be so reversed, I would not pronounce: nor how *sta* or *ista* forms part of the corruption. *Verpa* is used by

Catullus xxviii. 12 of a debauchee *cum isto uerpa*. Elsewhere it = mentula. This latter would be its meaning in vi. 12.

xxix. 6-8 Et ille nunc superbus et superfluens
Perambulabit omnium cubilia
Ut albulus columbus aut ydoneus?

I have not found any critic who has suggested what, I confess, only lately occurred to me as a possibility, that *idonius* (not *idoneus*) is the comparative of the adverb *idonee*, and that the verse, with *haut* for *aut*, is only another form of the construction found twice in Horace, *Epod.* v. 59 *Nardo perunctum, quale non perfectius Meae laborarint manus*, *S. i.* 5, 41 *quales neque candidiores Terra tulit, nec quis me sit deuinctor alter*, *ib.* 33 *Antoni non ut magis alter amicus*.

The adverbial comparative *idonius* is not

found in any writer of authority, but it is an existing form. *Neue-Wagener* cites it from Tertullian *de Pall.* 3 and *idonior*, which Charisius i. 16 will not allow, is found notwithstanding in the *Digest*, as well as in Tertullian and S. Augustine (*Neue-Wagener* ii. p. 206). It is well known that *idoneus* is often used *amatorie* = well adapted for love, i.e. with bodily capabilities such as the service of Venus requires: *Hor. C. iii.* 26 l *Vixi puellis nuper idoneus Et militavi non sine gloria*; and in itself it is exactly the right word to describe Mamurra, as successful with women.

Whether *ut* in such cases is 'that,' here *perambulauerit* 'that no white dove surpass him in fitness for the task,' or 'as' = 'in such a way as no white dove more fitly,' it is difficult to say. Wickham on *S. i.* 5 leans to the latter view: I rather incline to the former.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

DE MIRMONT ON THE MYTHOLOGY OF APOLLONIUS RHODIUS AND VERGIL.

Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile, La Mythologie et les Dieux dans les Argonautiques et dans l'Enéide. These présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris, par H. de la Ville de Mirmont, Maître de conférences à la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux. Paris, 1894. pp. viii. 778. 10 frs.

THE object of this thick volume is to show that the mythology of the *Aeneid* is not what it would have been had the *Argonautica* of Apollonius not existed. As a general statement this is of the nature of a truism, but M. de la Ville de Mirmont with extraordinary assiduity has carefully gone through all that occurs in both works bearing on the many points of resemblance and difference, and has produced a valuable comparative study of mythology. After we have got through the first book, which is devoted to Theogony and Cosmogony and the Hesiodic generations previous to Zeus, we find the gods arranged in pairs, Zeus—Jupiter, Hera—Juno, Athena—Minerva and so on. The conscientious minuteness with which it is all worked out rather causes the book to rank with a dictionary than as one to be read through continuously.

M. de Mirmont often calls attention to the way in which Vergil confuses deities which in early times were distinct, e.g. Apollo is confused with the god of healing and with the Sun-god, Lucina with Diana (in the fourth *Eclogue*), the Harpies with the Furies, while Apollonius is scrupulously exact in his mythological lore. The reason however, as he reminds us, is clear enough. It is that Vergil, in composing a national epic, treats mythology, within certain limits of course, as it suits his purpose, while mythology is of the essence of the purely literary epic of the Alexandrian writer. An 'extensive and peculiar' knowledge of mythology is (like Mr. Sam Weller's knowledge of London) a part of his apparatus, and a special 'note' of Alexandrian learning. We find it reproduced to a great extent in Ovid. I doubt however whether it is pushed by Apollonius quite to the extreme that M. de Mirmont thinks. I doubt, for instance, whether there is really meant to be any distinction between Typhaon and Typhoeus, or between Phorcus and Phorcyas.

The Zeus of Apollonius holds himself aloof from the other gods in a manner far

different from the Zeus of Homer. He interferes not at all in their affairs. Zeus in Apollonius is the Ptolemy of heaven and lives in a serene atmosphere of his own. Here Vergil goes back to the Homeric type, 'le Jupiter de l'*Énéide* s'intéresse aux affaires des dieux et fait sentir à ses sujets divins une autorité qui, pour être moins brutale que dans les poèmes homériques, n'en est que plus sûre et plus ferme.' The portraits of the other gods and goddesses also are influenced by Alexandrian notions. Hera is a great city lady. She is 'romanesque et nerveuse.' Of the famous interview of Hera and Athena with Aphrodite (Apollonius always calls her Cypris or Cytherea) at the beginning of the third book we are told 'Le poète des *Argonautiques* est bien plus voisin d'Euripide et surtout de Théocrite que d'Homère. Il sait conduire un dialogue aussi bien que le tragique athénien, et il se plaît à donner un pendant aux *Syracusaines* du poète alexandrin. Au lieu de deux petites bourgeoises, tracassières et bavardes, il met en scène de vraies grandes dames de la cour des Ptolémées, telles que les Bérénice ou les Arsinoé.' Hémardinger (in his dissertation *De Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticis*, Paris 1872) maintains that the Hera of Apollonius differs completely from the Juno of Vergil, in that she does no harm to any one and good to many, but M. de Mirmont shows without difficulty that, so far from this being the case, Hera protects Jason not for his own sake but in order to punish Pelias by bringing Medea over to Thessaly. So she pursues Heracles with her usual hatred and seems disposed to risk the ruin of the whole expedition by withdrawing him, rather than let him win any κῶδος in Colchis. At the same time it is obvious, for the economy of the poem, that Heracles had to be got rid of somehow at any price, and his disappearance is managed by the poet with much skill and grace. He is too prominent a member to take any but the first position, and then what becomes of Jason? Although Heracles waived the right of leadership all looked to him as the responsible person, and it was entirely due to his intervention that the Argonauts abandoned their luxurious life at Lemnos. In fact, just as his physical bulk depresses Argo, so does he outweigh all his companions in moral character.

M. de Mirmont is particularly strong in genealogy. He reminds us that Selene is the great-aunt of Medea and therefore hardly justified in confiding to that young

lady her own love for Endymion. But who thinks of this? Again Eros is spoken of as a great-uncle. But how can Eros be any one's great-uncle? What have great-uncles or great-aunts to do with Love? Again, it appears from Hesiod that Eurynome and Eidyia are both Oceanides. Now Eurynome is the wife of Ophion and actually two generations earlier than Zeus, whereas Eidyia is the wife of Aeetes and mother of Medea. How can such things be? M. de Mirmont reminds us however that Apollonius is careful to let us know that Eidyia is the *youngest* of the Oceanides and so the situation is saved. I rather fear that M. de Mirmont is making fun of his reader. It is hardly necessary to say that the chronology of poetical myths cannot be taken seriously. We are told that Apollonius takes care not to attribute to the heroes of the Argonautic expedition (which was one generation earlier than the Trojan War) opinions and customs which are later than Homer. This may be so generally speaking, but surely the science of augury is more advanced in Apollonius than it is represented to be in Homer. On M 239 Dr. Leaf remarks that in the Homeric age 'the art of augury is little developed and has little positive effect at any time. Signs encourage or discourage a resolution already formed, but they never determine or prevent any enterprise as they did in later times.' Now, in the third book of the *Argonautica*, it is the remonstrance of the crow that prevents Mopsos and Argos from accompanying Jason to his interview with Medea. But M. de Mirmont goes further than this. He also maintains that the non-mention of certain customs in the poem of Apollonius that are found in Homer is to be accounted for by the fact that such customs were *not* ante-Homeric and consequently were not known to the generation before Homer. Thus he quotes Bouché-Leclercq (*Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité*) as saying that the celebrated *νέκυν* of the *Odyssey* is the most ancient document that we possess on the subject, and adds himself that Apollonius, in order to preserve the archaic character of his poem, wishes to show that necromancy is not yet known. Accordingly when the shade of Sthenelos presents itself to the eyes of the Argonauts, they have not evoked it and do not profit by its presence to ask any questions. This theory however seems to be entirely gratuitous. There is no particular reason why the Argonauts should have interrogated the shade of Sthenelos.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

The present volume is not easy to criticize, consisting as it does of a number of details which are indeed most useful when any particular reference is required (and there is a capital index), but they rather take away from the unity of the whole and are often not connected with any salient differences of treatment by the two poets. I will conclude this rather desultory notice with a few remarks on some interpretations given by M. de Mirmont. He speaks of the 'tristes hurlements' of the Libyan nymphs at the union of Dido and Aeneas (iv. 168), for which no doubt there is the authority of Servius. I am disposed on this point to agree with Henry, Conington, and Gossrau, that the signs, if not those of an auspicious marriage, are at any rate of a neutral character, and certainly not inauspicious. Especially the word 'ululare' (the ὀλολογμός) is used of joyful cries at weddings. M. de Mirmont again agrees with Servius in taking *adventante dea* (vi. 258) to refer to Proserpine, but the previous line clearly points to Hecate, the commentators all take it so, and it is imitated from Ap. Rh. iii. 1217 where Hecate is in question. It appears also rather far-fetched to say that the legend of the abode of Cronos by the Adriatic sea is indicated by Aeschylus when he calls that sea κόλπον Πέας (if the Adriatic is there meant). It by no means follows that Cronos was banished to that part, because the sea was named after his wife. Nor do I agree with the interpretation here given of the much discussed

line *spargens humida mella soporiferumque papaver* (iv. 486), viz. that the dragon is kept by the priestess in a state of somnolence from which it is to be aroused if any impious person should attempt to snatch the fruit from the sacred branches. The unfortunate epithet *soporiferum*, the cause of all the trouble, seems to me to be rather the case of a standing epithet which happens to be singularly unsuitable to the context. There are several similar cases in Homer, e.g. ζ 26, where clothes that want washing are called σιγαλόεντα, and see *Classical Review* iii. 220. Finally, M. de Mirmont gives an ingenious solution of the statement of Servius on i. 23 '*Saturnia nomen quasi ad crudelitatem aptum posuit*' which in itself is true enough. But why should it be so? M. de Mirmont replies 'il faut supposer que le poëte indique simplement par *Saturnia* que Junon est la fille du vieux dieu local et bienfaisant de l'Italie, et que, par suite et à ce titre, elle est la protectrice de la race italienne autochtone et l'ennemie des Troyens et de leurs alliés qui vont imposer à la vieille terre de Saturne une domination nouvelle et étrangère. Par extension, l'épithète *Saturnia* l'applique non seulement à la Junon du Latium hostile aux Troyens étrangers, mais à l'Héra d'Argos ou à la grande divinité de Carthage considérée comme ennemie d'Énée et de son peuple.' I do not know if this has been said before, but it seems worthy of consideration.

R. C. SEATON.

FACSIMILE OF THE LAURENTIAN AESCHYLUS.

L'Eschilo Laurenziano. Florence. 1896.

A WORD of welcome should be given to the long-desired appearance of the facsimile of the Laurentian Aeschylus, which has now been issued by Signor Biagi, the Director of the Medicean-Laurentian Library in Florence, with an introduction by Professor Enrico Rostagno, the keeper of the MSS. in that Library.

The work of photogravure has been admirably executed under the auspices of the Italian Board of Public Instruction, and Professor Rostagno has very carefully examined the calligraphy of the famous

codex, and has given a new account of the various hands employed. He has also ascertained some important facts bearing on the history of the MS. from the time when it was brought to Italy.

Italian scholars have peculiar advantages in the matter of palaeography, of which such men as Vitelli, Castellani, and Rostagno have diligently availed themselves.

An index of the contents of the 71 plates, enabling the student to refer at once to any passage, forms a most valuable addition to the work.

Merkel's attempt to represent the state of the MS. by typography, elaborate as it was,

left much to be desired; and Vitelli's collation, the most careful hitherto, published by Wecklein in 1885, could not be all included even in that elaborate edition. Various *minutiae* which Vitelli had noted, were inevitably dropped. The value of the present facsimile is therefore manifest. And any one who thinks it worth while to devote a special study to the scholia, will

find much here to interest him. He will see, for example, that Wecklein's note on *Cho.* 424, *παρὰ τοὺς ἀπρίξ πλησὸν τὰ ἀπρίξ* (fort. *παρὰ τὸ ἀπρίξ καὶ πλησσειν, τὰ ἀπρίξ πλησόμενα*), is much too diffuse, and by the change of one letter (the crossing of a τ) it is easy to read *παρὰ τὸ ἀπρίξ πλησσόντα ἀπρίξ*.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

HOLDEN'S EDITION OF THE *OECONOMICUS*.

The 'Oeconomicus' of Xenophon. By H. A. HOLDEN, M.A., LL.D. Fifth edition. Macmillan. 1895. 5s.

THE *Oeconomicus* is not only the most pleasing of Xenophon's shorter works, but its absolute merit and attractiveness are considerable. It is satisfactory therefore to find that Dr. Holden has been called upon for a fifth edition of his well-known and extremely serviceable book. He has not been content with a perfunctory revision of it, for it seems thoroughly and judiciously revised from beginning to end. The introduction is new. The critical notes have been brought up to date and, though brief in expression, err if anything from over-completeness. It is not every suggestion that deserves to be recorded. They are now placed where critical notes, more than any others, should certainly be—at the foot of the page, not banished to a few separate pages of their own which the reader has a difficulty in finding. The copious commentary has been pruned and compressed, not without addition of fresh matter. Readers of Dr. Holden's books know how careful he is to leave nothing unnoticed, to give the matter of a book all the illustration and explanation that it wants, and to supply a full grammatical commentary either in words of his own or by reference to the most authoritative grammars. All this has been done thoroughly in the present case so as to keep the book up to the level of current scholarship. Dr. Holden's industry and insight are most of all conspicuous in what he modestly calls the 'index' substituted for the 'lexicon' of his former editions. The lexicon was almost a full index, and the full index is an excellent lexicon in which the uses of a word, even the commonest (such as some lexicons foolishly pass over, as though very common

words did not repay and require study), are carefully noted and discriminated. If everyone who edits any portion of a classical author took half Dr. Holden's trouble in the preparation of a scholarly index, our dictionaries would soon be much more satisfactory than they are at present. Any student who after reading the book itself goes carefully through the lexicon-index will add largely to his knowledge of Greek.

The suggestions on the text of the *Oeconomicus* published in the March and April numbers of this *Review* will show that I think it at present very far from perfect. I regret that they were written before the publication of the present edition, though they only appeared after it, and that they contain here and there comments upon statements which Dr. Holden has withdrawn or modified. He has also recorded in his critical notes some emendations of other scholars coinciding (as I too mentioned) with mine: and if they had found their way into an English edition when I wrote I should not have thought it worth while to dwell upon them. But I do not find that on all the passages he has mentioned in a brief note (*C.R.* for May, p. 215) my remarks on the text or on his way of dealing with it are now superfluous, though it is with great respect for him that I venture upon criticism.

It is much to be wished that so excellent a Xenophontean scholar should edit more of the *opera minora* than the *Oeconomicus* and the *Hiero*. There is not one of them, even including the *Hipparchicus* and the *De Re Equestri*, that would not repay editing, and some of them call for it very distinctly. The political tracts, whether Xenophon's or not, are interesting and important: yet there has been no thorough edition with a commentary of any one of them for a long time past. The tract on *Hunting*, besides raising some curious critical questions, is fairly readable and in England ought to

be read. But above all one would wish Dr. Holden to finish off at least the Socratic works and to give us a *Symposium* with the *Apologia* for an appendix. In the meantime the *Oeconomicus*, which is perhaps better

adapted for school and university reading, has been fortunate in finding so careful and sound an editor.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

MORGAN'S EIGHT ORATIONS OF LYSIAS.

Eight Orations of Lysias. Edited by MORRIS H. MORGAN. Pp. iii.+223. 'College Series of Greek Authors.' Boston. 1895.

THIS work will commend itself to many because of the clear presentation it gives of the manners, customs, and laws involved in these speeches. Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*—under a Latin title—is judiciously cited. The text shows careful study and a wise selection where there is choice of readings. Grammatical notes are plentiful but rather elementary for college work. Some of them are open to question on the score of correctness. In vii. 12 ἐγίγνετο belongs to the imperfects of likelihood as in 14 and 32. In the same oration in 18 the note explains περὶ ὧν...περὶ ἐκείνων thus: 'rare instead of the usual περὶ ὧν alone or περὶ ἐκείνων ᾧ'; but what is rare is not the precedence of the relative clause followed by the emphatic demonstrative; the irregularity is περὶ ὧν instead of ᾧ...περὶ ἐκείνων as in Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 252 ἧν...περὶ ταύτης.

In xii. 84 βούλοιο is explained as an

optative without ἄν: but it is a protasis, not an apodosis.

In xvi. 1 τῶν βεβωμένων is noted as a 'somewhat rare use of the partic. as subst.' The note was probably designed to call attention to the use of this verb in the passive.

The notes on the rhetoric are 'sadly to seek' and the characteristics of Lysias' style are summarized in the introduction to the book and then dismissed from further consideration. At the end of the selections, in xxxii., the comments of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the speech in question are given. It seems a pity that the other speeches should not be read in the light of these illuminating comments.

In short, the student would learn from this edition that Lysias is 'rich in material for the fascinating study of the every-day manners and customs of Athenian antiquity,' but for all the rest, he might as well be reading Xenophon or any one else as Lysias, since he is not made to feel what constitutes the individual excellence of Lysias.

A. LEACH.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE JACOBSEN COLLECTION OF SCULPTURE.

La Glyptothèque Ny-Carlsberg, fondée par Carl Jacobsen. *Les Monuments Antiques*, Choix et Texte de PAUL ARNDT. Livraison I. (Munich: 'Verlagsanstalt für Kunst und Wissenschaft.') 1896. 20 Mk.

THE name of M. Jacobsen is a familiar one to archaeologists. Those especially whose studies have led to travel in Italy and Greece cannot fail to have heard of the great

collector who has year by year been devoting a vast fortune to the acquisition of ancient sculptures, and forming in his native country of Denmark such a private collection as is probably unequalled north of the Alps—a collection in which the famous Borghese Anacreon is but one amongst many masterpieces. It will therefore be no matter of surprise that in the present publication he is offering a work which must take its place on the shelves of archaeological libraries and be studied by all whose interest lies in ancient sculpture.

The present instalment is the first of twenty-two, each of which will contain ten plates. The execution of these is due to the firm best known under the name of Bruckmann, and is uniform with that of the series of *Denkmäler* partly carried out by Brunn, and continued since his death by Arndt, who is responsible for the text which accompanies the plates. This text, to judge from the specimen before us, is modelled on such examples as that of Furtwängler to the 'Collection Sabouroff.' It contains a certain number of illustrations supplementary to the plates. It is the editor's intention to publish the sculptures in chronological order, but an exception is made in the case of the first part, which comprises, along with the text of Plates I.—X., a selection of plates illustrating the collection as a whole. Amongst the works represented a finely preserved bronze statuette of Herakles is perhaps the most remarkable. The continuous series of plates will be opened by a reproduction of the well-known 'Rayethhead,' which has passed into M. Jacobsen's possession. It is scarcely necessary to say that the publication promises to be, from the scientific and artistic points of view, adequate to the subject. The only deduction to be made in estimating its importance is due to the fact that the portraits, in which the Jacobsen collection is especially rich, are excluded from the present work, since they have been incorporated with the series of ancient portraits which Arndt is publishing in a similar form as a kind of appendix to the Brunn-Bruckmann *Denkmäler*.

H. STUART JONES.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Delphi.—A bronze statue has been recently found, 5 ft. 9 in. in height, which is supposed to represent Hieron son of Deinomenes, the tyrant of Syracuse, and to have belonged to a group of figures dedicated to commemorate one of his victories in the Pythian games. The group probably resembled that seen by Pausanias at Olympia representing Hieron on a quadriga, which is said by Pausanias to have been executed by Calamis and Onatas (vi. 12, 1). This statue is almost complete, except for the left arm, and wears a diadem and long girt chiton falling in regular folds. The hair is carefully arranged with long locks falling over the ears and temples, and the eyes have been inserted in *smalto* enamel, which is perfectly preserved. The figure is bearded, and full of grace and naturalness of expression. The right hand holds part of a horse's bridle, and various fragments of feet and tails of the horses of the quadriga were also found. Near this statue were found an inscription, attributed by M. Homolle to

464 B.C., which may or may not have reference to the statue, and a bronze statuette of Apollo, eight inches in height.¹

Messene.—The fountain of Arsinoe mentioned by Pausanias (iv. 31, 6) has been discovered; the eastern wall of marble with an outlet is preserved, and part of a marble conduit inside. A large part of the ancient market has also been laid bare, especially a fine building with propylaea and halls. A number of inscriptions were found, some of historical importance. One gives the boundaries of the ancient Messene, and in another a *ραῖς* and *ἀντιστράτης* Marcus is named, who restored four *στοαί* of the Asklepieion, and *τὰς παραστάδας τὰς κατὰ τὸ Κασόπειον*. In a third an Aristaeus is mentioned who was *γραμματεὺς τῶν συνόδων* and *ἀγορανόμος*; he was also an ambassador to Nero from Greece.²

Mycenae.—A small but finely-worked gold figure of a bull lying down has been found; the animal has a golden chain hanging from the horns, and is evidently destined for sacrifice. A painted sandstone *stele* and a very archaic metope from a temple, of *poros*-stone, have also been found. During the year 1895 fifteen rock-tombs were opened outside the Acropolis, containing stone and clay vessels, gold rings, mirrors, and weapons.³

Melos.—The results of the excavations undertaken by the British School this season have been made known. A house of the Roman period was laid bare containing a number of chambers, from one of which a whole row of columns was obtained; this chamber contained a very fine mosaic pavement. In the centre of the pavement is a circle, in which are fishes and marine beasts, and round it are four masks. On either side is a square of geometrical patterns, and round the whole a wreath of flowers. The mosaic also bears an inscription *μόνον μὴ ὕβρις*. The walls of this house have been decorated in rich colours, but very little is preserved. Several important statues were found, including that of a hierophant wearing chiton and skin, of good Roman work, inscribed *Μάριον Τρόφιμον τῶν ἱεροφάντων οἱ μυσταί*; the head and left hand are missing. Another statue was dedicated to *Διόνυσος Τριετηρικός*. This building probably served for assemblies of worshippers of Dionysos, as in Athens. Among other statues may be mentioned a colossal one, perhaps of Apollo, the head and limbs missing, and four draped torsos from the place where the Aphrodite was found, one probably representing Agrippina. Some thirty inscriptions were found, mostly in the peculiar Melian alphabet. A tentative exploration resulted in the discovery of a Mycenaean site from which some interesting gold ornaments were obtained, and some Melian vases have also been discovered.⁴

Thera.—The Germans have started excavations here, and M. Santorin (*sic*) is reported to have found a statue of Aphrodite closely resembling that from Melos; unfortunately the head is lost.⁵

Crete.—Mr. Arthur Evans has recently returned from a journey in the Dictaeon region of this island, where he secured, or obtained impressions of, fifteen new examples of primitive bead-seals with pictographs, all of steatite; he attributes them to a pre-Mycenaean period. He has also found a new class of seal in green jasper and carnelian on Mycenaean sites, presenting analogies to Hittite forms, and one from

¹ *Athenaeum*, 30 May.

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 6 June.

³ *Academy*, 16 May.

⁴ *Standard*, 8 June.

Præses with a purely pictorial design in Mycenaean style of two goats browsing. From a pre-historic acropolis was obtained a much ruder seal in the form of a finger-shaped piece of steatite with three engraved characters, and another affording a link with the pre-Mycenaean class of pictographic seals; several symbols on the latter seal are quite new. A fragment of a Mycenaean *piithos* and a steatite lentoid gem of early Mycenaean period, both with grafitto inscriptions, were also found. Mr. Evans made a remarkable discovery in the cave of Psychro on Mount Ida, in the form of a fragment of dark steatite with characters resembling the Mycenaean script on

the seal-stones, and derivable from pictographs. They form apparently an inscription of nine letters with two punctuations, the letters having probably syllabic values. With this object was found a broken 'table of offerings' of steatite with cup-shaped receptacles, which appears to be a relic of a pre-historic cult; it was surrounded by bronze figures of men and animals, in a style which suggests the Vaphio cups. Mr. Evans would date these finds as far back as 1300 B.C.¹

H. B. WALTERS.

¹ *Academy*, 13 June.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 153. Parts 3 and 4. 1896.

Die Inschriften des Wüstenempels von Redésye, W. Schwarz. This temple was discovered by Cailliaud in 1816 but he gave only the most important inscriptions. The 58 described by Lepsius in his *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Äthiopien* are here criticized. Zu *Xenophons Apomnemoneumata*, F. Reuss. Defends the text $\eta \rho \acute{o} \nu \omega$ in i 5, 1, or would prefer $\kappa \rho \acute{o} \nu \omega$ to $\delta \kappa \rho \acute{o} \nu \omega$ [Cl. Rev. ix. 141]. Zu *Homers Odyssee*, E. Schulze. In ϵ 344 proposes $\eta \rho \acute{o} \nu \omega$ for $\delta \rho \acute{o} \nu \omega$. Über die anapästischen einzugslieder des chors der griechischen tragödie und den aufbau des *Asias*, des *Philoctetes*, der *Eumeniden* und des *Agamemnon*, C. Conradt. A criticism on the views of Oeri, Wilamowitz and Kirchhoff. Zum *altgriechischen theater*, W. Dörpfeld. A reply to Weissmann's criticism of Dörpfeld's views on the 'thymele-question' [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 77]. *Xenophons Kynegiticos*, K. Lincke. Thinks that the sons of Xenophon took part in the introduction and conclusion at least. *Die mythologischen quellen für Philodemos schrift nepl eubebelas*, J. Dietze. The theological source was Apollodoros' *nepl theōn*, the mythographical Apollodoros' *bibliotheca*, and the Epicurean source Zeno or Phaedrus. Über die *publicationskosten der attischen volkesbeschlüsse*, E. Drerup. *Aristoteles und Drakon*, F. Susemihl. On the question whether there is any contradiction in 'A θ . πολ. 4, 1 and the words in Pol. ii. 12, 1274^b 15-18 $\Delta \rho \acute{\alpha} \kappa \omega \nu \tau \circ \varsigma \delta \epsilon \nu \omicron \mu \circ \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma$, πολίταις $\delta \epsilon$ $\epsilon \pi \alpha \rho \chi \alpha \nu \tau \circ \varsigma$ τοὺς νόμους $\epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ [Cl. Rev. ix. 478]. $\Sigma \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \beta \circ \varsigma$ und *Exacraembus*, A. Fleckeisen. The *vinarius Exacraembus* in Pl. Asin. 436 is the Greek $\kappa \alpha \rho \eta \nu \circ \varsigma$ $\Sigma \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \beta \circ \varsigma$. Zu *Ciceros Briefen an Atticus*, O. E. Schmidt. A critical examination of x. 1. *Caesars zweite expedition nach Britannien*, F. Vogel. A long article treating successively of the worthless account of Dion Cassius, the trustworthiness of the letters of Cicero, the chronological foundations, the date of the crossing and return, and the difficulties encountered.

Part 5. 1896.

Zu *Xenophons Hellenika* und *Agessilaos*, G. Friedrich. Chiefly on the relation of Xenophon to Thucydides. Zu *Lysias* und *Lucianos*, P. K. Müller. Various critical remarks. *Das astronomische system des Herakleides von Pontus*, F. Hultsch. The information upon this system given us by Theon of Smyrna is much nearer the genuine H. than that given by the much later Chalcidius. Zu *Sextos Empiricos*, O. Höfer. In *πρὸς μαθητ.* xi. 91 for *ἐφ' ἑ* *ἐμπερ* would read *ἐμφαίρειν*. *Diodoros und Theopompus*, F. Reuss. Maintains against Volz that

sen that Theopompus is one of the sources of Diodorus. *Der philosoph Agatharchides in der ersten hezede Diodors* I, E. A. Wagner. To show how greatly Diod. was indebted to Agatharchides of Knidos in these books [Cl. Rev. ix. 284]. *Die anapästische der parabasis*, F. Susemihl. While it is admitted that the parabasis is the oldest part of the Attic comedy, and that the use of the anapaestic tetrameter came from Sicily, yet originally the parabasis had no anapaests. *Rhythmische prosa aus Ägypten*, F. Blass. Finds rhythmic prose in the 'Alexandrian erotic fragment' recently published by Mr. Grenfell. *Zu Ciceros Briefen*, W. Sternkopf. In Div. ii. 7, 4 would read *sed tum quasi a senatore < adulescente >*, nobilissimo tamen adulescente < gratiosissimo, nunc a tr. pl. et a Curione tribuno. *Plutarchs Quellen zu den biographien der Gracchen*, W. Soltan. For the whole of later Roman history Plutarch and Appian used the same sources [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 223].

Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik. Ed. E. Wölfflin. Vol. 10. Part 1. 1896.

Der reflexive Gebrauch der Verba intransitiva, E. Wölfflin. Some of these are *recipere*, *derigere*, *vertere* and compounds, *flectere* and compounds, *applicare*, *corrige* and *emendare*. The use of present participles act. in a middle sense is due to the want of a pass. pres. partic. *Der Infinitiv meminere*, E. Wölfflin. Servius knew of this infinitive but did not use it. *Beiträge zur lateinischen Glossographie*, O. B. Schluter. *Oculis contractare*, S. Brandt. *Incommoditas*, J. v. d. Vliet. *Uelum = navigium*, rotis, J. v. d. Vliet. *Die entwicklung des livianischen Stiles*, S. G. Stacey. A long dissertation of above 60 pages. The relations of Livy to Ennius, Vergil's Bucolics and Georgics, Vergil's Aeneid, Lucretius, Tibullus and Horace respectively are treated, and then some points of improvement and alteration in Livy's style in the course of his work, and finally some remarks are made on Livy's own judgments and quotations. *Lateinische Pflanzennamen im Dioskorides*, H. Stadler. *Cio and Lato*, F. Schöll. *Die Berner Fragmente des lateinischen Dioskorides*, T. E. Auracher. Here given in full. *Pone und Post*, E. Wölfflin. These words are etymologically the same. Early writers confine *pone* to place and *post* to time. Tacitus and other later writers do not observe this distinction. *Accipio*, lexicon-article, O. Hey. *Zur Lehre vom Imperativ*, E. Wölfflin. In archaic Latin the subject and object of the imper. are omitted, and the sense is left to the reader to ascertain. Words *accognosco*—*accommodus*, E. Wölfflin.

MISCELLAN. *Vibenna*, *Vivenna*, E. Lattes. The former is the correct form. *Eversuiri*, F. Wehrich. A late form of fut. inf. pass. *Præscus* = ἡγούμενος, P. Geyer. Zu 'amabo,' H. Blase. This word is used in the comic writers, either by women to women, as always in Terence, or more rarely by men to women. *Sponte sua*, E. Wölfflin. This order is not

found in Cic. or Caes. but is found in the poets and later writers. *Temere ein Tribrachys*, E. Wölfflin. *Temere* occurs as a tribrach twice in Plautus, so must be considered as neut. of **temeris* not **temcrus*. Among the notices of books is a very favourable one of Lindsay's *Latin Language* by A. Funk.

A NEW MS. OF CATULLUS.

I HAVE recently found in the Vatican Library a MS. of Catullus of high importance, hidden under a false number. The true one is Ott. 1829. The MS. is clearly, at the least, next to O and G in rank, and in all probability is of the same rank—in other words, it is probably, like O and G, an independent copy of the last Verona MS. Its style would indicate the last part of the fourteenth century, or the early years of the fifteenth. It promises to be of great service, not only in confirming O and G where they agree, and giving a 'casting vote' where they disagree; but also in throwing light upon the relationships of other MSS., and upon the history of the marginal and interlinear variants in various MSS.

There have been, as in the case of G, not a few erasures and changes, but in the majority of instances the original reading can be made out with certainty.

I have for some time been engaged in collating the MS., and the results, together with a discussion of a number of points of interest, will appear in the following winter in vol. i. of the Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. At my request the Vatican will publish a complete facsimile, which will appear at the same time with my collation.


W. GARDNER HALE,
Director of the American School of
Classical Studies in Rome.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aropolis of Athens. Wall-map. 62 × 73 centim. München, Oldenbourg. 5 Mk.
Aeschines. Orationes, post F. Frankium cur. Fr. Blass. Editio major, aucta indice verborum a S. Preuss confecto. 8vo. xv, 522 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
— the Index Aeschineus separately. (189 pp.) 2 Mk. 40. Pf.
Aeschylus. L'Eschilo laurenziano. Facsimile pubblicato sottogli auspici del Ministero dell'istruzione pubblica, con prefazione dell dott. Enr. Rostagno. Oblong folio. 9 pp., 71 plates. The edition of this facsimile is restricted to 200 copies. £5 5s.
Alterthümer (Die) unserer heidnischen Vorzeit. Nach den in öffentlichen und Privatsammlungen befindlichen Originalien zusammengestellt und herausgegeben von dem römischgermanischen Centralmuseum in Mainz, durch dessen Conservator L. Lindenschmit Sohn. Vol. iv, Part 10. 4to. 21 pp., 1 coloured and 5 phototype plates. Mainz, Zabern. 4 Mk.
Aristoteles. Bobba (Romualdo.) La dottrina dell' intelletto in Aristotele e nei suoi più illustri interpreti. 8vo. viii, 479 pp. Turin, Clausen. 10 lire.
— Goebel, Uebersetzung von Buch A der Metaphysik des Aristoteles. 4to. 16 pp. Soest.

- Aristoteles*. Gomperz (Th.) Zu Aristoteles' Poetik. II. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften.') 8vo. 22 pp. Wien, Gerold. 70 Pf.
— Zijsa (J.) Die Aristotelische Anschauung von dem Wesen und der Bewegung des Lichtes. 4to. 12 pp. Breslau.
Ballas (E.) Specimen lexici Cornelian. Pars I. 4to. 16 pp. Fraustadt.
Bupp (K.) Prometheus. Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Mythologie. 4to. 46 pp. Oldenburg.
Barbarus. Hoever (J. J.) Die Excerpta Latina Barbari. II. Teil. Die Sprache des Barbarus. 4to. 27 pp. Köln.
Batrachomachia (die homerische) des Karers Pigres, nebst Scholien und Paraphrase. Herausgegeben und erläutert von A. Ludwig. 8vo. vi, 484 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 20 Mk.
Bernhardt (H.) Chronologie der mithridatischen Kriege und Aufklärung einiger Theile derselben. 4to. 26 pp. Marburg.
Callimachus. Weinberger (W.) Kallimacheische Studien. 8vo. 24 pp. Wien.
Capelle (W.) De Cynicorum epistulis. 8vo. 62 pp. Göttingen.
Caspari (A.) De Cynicis, qui fuerunt aetate imperatorum Romanorum. 4to. 26 pp. Chemnitz.

- Cicero*. Strenge (J.) Das Moment des Komischen in Ciceros Rede pro Murena. 4to. 14 pp. Parchim.
- Clasen, Timoleon, eine historische Untersuchung. 4to. 33 pp. Glückstadt.
- Commentationes philologiae Ienenses, ediderunt Seminarii philologorum Ienensis professores. Vol. VI, Pars I. 8vo. iii, 133 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 20.
- Curvius* (E.) Die Schatzhäuser von Olympia. 8vo. 13 pp. Berlin.
- Dionysius*. Stiglmayr (J.) Das Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Lateranconcil 649. Ein zweiter Beitrag zur Dionysios-Frage. 8vo. 96 pp. Feldkirch.
- Du Mesnil* (A.) Erklärende Beiträge zu lateinischen Schulschriftstellern, vornehmlich zu Cicero, Tacitus, Horaz. 4to. 37 pp. Frankfurt-a.-M.
- Eins* (R.) Das Rudern bei den Alten. Eine technisch-historische Studie. 4to. 18 pp., 4 plates. Danzig.
- Etymologicum*. Carnuth (O.) Das Etymologicum Florentinum Parvum und das sogenannte Etymologicum Magnum genuinum. 8vo. 42 pp. Königsberg.
- Euripides*. Théâtre d'Euripide et fragments. Traduction nouvelle par G. Hinstin. 2 vols. 16mo. xv, 456 pp.; 453 pp. Paris, Hachette. Each volume 3 fr. 50.
- Busche (K.) Euripides' Iphigenie in Aulis. Proben einer erklärenden Ausgabe. 4to. 16 pp. Leer.
- Masquerai (P.) De tragica ambiguitate apud Euripidem. 8vo. 70 pp. Paris.
- Wecklein (N.) Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides. 8vo. 65 pp. München.
- Forum romanum at the time of the Empire. Wall-map. 62 x 73 centim. München, Oldenbourg. 5 Mk.
- Frenzel (J.) Die Entwicklung des temporalen Satzbaues im Griechischen. I. Die Sätze mit *πρὶν*. 8vo. 30 pp. Wölgrowitz.
- Fumagalli (G.) La vita dei Romani. 16mo. 183 pp., engravings. Milano.
- Gardthausen (V.) Augustus und seine Zeit. Vol. I, Part 2. (v, pp., pp. 483-1032, 1 plate.) 12 Mk. Vol. II, Part 2. (pp. 277-648.) 9 Mk. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 21 Mk.
- Gillischevski (H.) De Aetolorum praetoribus intra annos 221 et 168 a. Chr. n. munere functis. 8vo. 62 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 50.
- Gobin (L.) Viae apud Arvernos romanae, quibus monumentis, seu vestigiis restitui posse videantur. 8vo. 65 pp., 2 plates. Clermont-Ferrand.
- Granius Licinianus. Dieckmann (O.) De Granii Liciniani fontibus et auctoritate. I. 8vo. 47 pp. Berlin.
- Hamelbeck,  Der ioniens a maiore mit aufgelöster Länge in den lyrischen und chorischen Dichtungen der Griechen. 4to. 35 pp. Mülheim.
- Hediecke (E.) Specimen interpretationis latinae. 4to. 23 pp. Sorau.
- Heine (F.) Methodische Behandlung der Darsätze im Lateinischen. 4to. 80 pp. Kreuzburg.
- Herodotus. Nikel (J.) Das Geschichtswerk Herodots im Lichte der Assyriologie. I. Teil. 4to. 23 pp., and engraving. Breslau.
- Stourac (F.) Ueber den Gebrauch des Genitivus bei Herodot. (4. Continuation). 8vo. 22 pp. Olmütz.
- Hippocrates. Apollonius von Kitium, illustrirter Kommentar zu der Hippocratischen Schrift *περί ἁρθρῶν*. Herausgegeben von Herm. Schöne. 4to. xxxix, 35 pp., 31 phototype plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Homerus. Irmischer (E.) Homers Odyssee, Buch VI, Nachdichtung. 4to. 6 pp. Dresden.
- Jelinek (F.) Homerische Untersuchungen. I. Theil. (Die Widersprüche im II. Theile der Odyssee. Versuch einer Herstellung der Verwandlungso dyssee.) 8vo. 50 pp. Wien.
- Lehnert (G.) De scholiis ad Homerum rhetoricis. 8vo. 111 pp. Leipzig.
- Isocrates. Galle (P.) Beiträge zur Erklärung der XVII. Rede (Trapezitikos) des Isocrates und zur Frage ihrer Echtheit. 4to. 28 pp. Zittau.
- Jeep (L.) Alia. 8vo. 7 pp. Königsberg.
- Joseph (Flavii.) Opera omnia, post Imm. Bekkerum recogn. S. A. Naber. Vol. VI. (Finis.) 12mo. li, 374 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Niese (B.) Flavii Josephi epitomae pars IX. 4to. 41 pp. Marburg.
- Unger (G.) Zu Josephus. 8vo. 54 pp. München.
- Juvenalis. Polstorff (H.) In Juvenalis satiras observationes criticae. 4to. 20 pp. Güstrow.
- Kiesevelter (K.) Der Occultismus des Alterthums. Vol. II. (Griechen—Römer—Alexandriner, Neupythagoraeer und Neuplatoniker—Kelten und Germanen—Barbarische Völker.) 8vo. pp. 439-921. Leipzig, Friedrich. 9 Mk.
- Kuecht (A.) Die Religions-Politik Kaiser Justinians. I. 8vo. iv, 148 pp. Würzburg.
- Lautensack. Grammatiche Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern. I. Personalendungen. 4to. 32 pp. Gotha.
- Linde (C.) De proverborum apud tragicos Graecos usu. 4to. 31 pp. Helmstedt.
- Marcellus Sideta. Roscher (W. H.) Das von der Kyanthropie handelnde Fragment des Marcellus von Side. (Aus 'Abhandlungen der Kgl. Sachs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.') 8vo. 92 pp., 3 engravings. Leipzig, Hirzel. 4 Mk.
- Maximus Tyrius. Hobein (H.) De Maximo Tyrio quaestiones philologiae selectae. 8vo. iii, 99 pp. Göttingen.
- Milchhofer (A.) Das archaologische Sculpturen-Museum der Kieler Universität. 8vo. 16 pp. Kiel. 1 Mk.
- Nicolaus Damascenus. Tietz (P.) De Nicolai Damasceni fontibus quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 40 pp. Marburg.
- Novák (R.) Observationes in scriptores historiae Augustae. 8vo. 42 pp. Prag.
- Ovid. Anderson (J. N.) On the sources of Ovid's Heroides I, III, VII, X, XII. 8vo. 139 pp. Berlin. 2 Mk. 50.
- Ehwald (R.) Kritische Beiträge zu Ovid's Epistulae ex Ponto. 8vo. 86 pp. Gotha, Perthes. 2 Mk.
- Philo. Unna (J.) Ueber den Gebrauch der Absichtssätze bei Philo von Alexandrien. 8vo. 51 pp. Würzburg.
- Pindarus. Boedeker (J.) Pindari carmen isthmicum tertium num in duo carmina dividendum sit. 8vo. 41 pp. Münster.
- Plancus. Rhodius (A.) De L. Munati Planci sermone. 4to. 40 pp. Bautzen.
- Platon's ausgewählte Dialoge, erklärt von H. Petersen. Vol I. Apologie. Kriton. Text und Anmerkungen. vii, 114, 36 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 50.
- Brinkmann (W.) Die Erkenntnisstheorie in Platon's Theaetet. 4to. 24 pp. Bergedorf.
- Plautus. Sydow (K.) Zum Gebrauch von adeo bei Plautus. 4to. 13 pp. Stettin.
- Plotinus. Pisyros (L.) Die Tugendlehre des Plotin

- mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Begriffe des Bösen und der Katharsis. 8vo. 45 pp. Leipzig.
- Poehlmann* (Rob.) Grundriss der griechischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde. Second edition. (Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaft von I. von Müller. Vol. III. Pt. IV.) 8vo. vi, 268 pp. München, Beck. 5 Mk.
- Reich* (H.) Ueber die Quellen der ältesten römischen Geschichte und die römische Nationaltragedie. 8vo. 17 pp. Königsberg.
- Reinhardt* (K.) Lateinische Satzlehre. 8vo. xi, 197 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 40.
- Rutilius*. Krieg (T.) Quaestiones Rutilianae. 8vo. 48 pp. Jena.
- Schmid* (W.) Der Atticismus in seinem Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus. Vol. IV. 8vo. 734 pp. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 15 Mk.
- Schneider* (Arth.) Das alte Rom. Grundriss und Geschichte seiner Bauten. Oblong Folio. xii. pp. of letterpress, 12 maps, 14 plates, and a plan of modern Rome. Leipzig, Teubner. 16 Mk.
- Schwab* (O.) Die syntaktischen Steigerungsmittel der griechischen Sprache in der klassischen Litteratur. (I. Teil.) 8vo. 43 pp. Würzburg.
- Seeger* (H.) Elemente der lateinischen Syntax mit systematischer Berücksichtigung des Französischen. 8vo. viii, 270 pp. Wismar, Hinstorff. 2 Mk. 40.
- Seneca*. Delhorbe (Ch.) De Senecae tragici substantivis. 8vo. 133 pp. Bern. 2 Mk.
- Servius*. Haberdia (A.) Meletemata Serviana. 8vo. 20 pp. Brunn.
- Sittl* (K.) Die Anschauungsmethode in der Altertumswissenschaft. 8vo. iii, 41 pp. Gotha, Perthes. 60 Pf.
- Sophocles*. Sechs Tragödien in deutscher Nachbildung von Fz. Bader. 8vo. ix, 497 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 4 Mk. 80.
- Chorlieder und Wechselgesänge aus den Tragödien, in deutscher Uebersetzung von W. Hoffmann. I. König Oedipus auf Kolonos. Antigone. 4to. 30 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.
- Les Trachiniennes, expliquées littéralement par Benloew et traduites en français par Bellaguet. 16mo. 179 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 fr. 50 ct.
- Otte (H.) Wortwiederholungen bei Sophocles. 4to. 26 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.
- Sophocles*. Wittekind (H.) Sermo Sophocleus quatenus cum scriptoribus Ionicis congruat, differat ab Atticis. 8vo. 57 pp. Giessen.
- Stenzel* (T.) Scheideformen in Latein. 4to. 12 pp. Patschkau.
- Tacitus*. Altenburg (O.) Probe einer Schulauslegung von Tacitus' Agricola. 4to. 20 pp. Wohlau.
- Czyckiewicz (A.) De dativi usu taciteo. 8vo. 27 pp. Brody. 1 Mk.
- Theocritus*. Bethé (E.) De Theocriti editionibus antiquissimis commentatio. 4to. 13 pp. Rostock.
- Theophilus Antiochenis*. Gross (O.) Die Gotteslehre des Theophilus von Antiochia. 4to. 34 pp. Chemnitz.
- Theophrastus*. Gercke (A.) Θεοφράστου περί πυρός. 8vo. 63 pp. Greifswald.
- Tolkiehn* (J.) De Livi Andronici Odyssea et de Cn. Matii Iliade latina. Accedit appendicula de T. Livio in Prisciani libris laudato. 8vo. 8 pp. Königsberg.
- Troost*. Das sittliche Bewusstsein des Homerischen Zeitalters. 4to. 26 pp. Frankenstein.
- Vergilius*. Le Breton (A.) De animalibus apud Vergilium. 8vo. 112 pp. Paris.
- Peters (K.) Schulwörterbuch zu Virgil's Aeneis. 8vo. viii, 214 pp. Gotha, Perthes. 2 Mk. 50.
- Wagner* (R.) Der Entwicklungsgang der griechischen Heldensage. 4to. 40 pp. Dresden.
- Wilisch* (E.) Geschichte Korinths von den Perserkriegen bis zum dreissigjährigen Frieden. 4to. 46 pp. Zittau.
- Wolff* (Eug.) Quae ratio intercedat inter Lysiae epitaphium et Isocratis panegyricum. 8vo. 43 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.
- Xenophon*. Köhler (U.) Ueber die Πολιτεία Λακεδαιμονίων Xenophon's. 8vo. 17 pp. Berlin.
- Krieger (E.) Die Präpositionem ἐπὶ und πρός in Xenophon's Anabasis und im griechischen Unterricht. (Continuation.) 4to. 21 pp. Gumbinnen.
- Zahn* (R.) Die Darstellung der Barbaren in griechischer Litteratur und Kunst der vorhellenistischen Zeit. I. Teil. 8vo. 80 pp. Heidelberg.
- Zingg* (Ed.) Die Elemente der lateinischen Formenlehre und Syntax. 8vo. 21 pp. Basel, Schwabe. 65 Pf.